SCHOLA RELIGIONIS PACIFICI
COND AD 1924
PRO
VERITATE
ET
REGNO
DEI
CHARLES HOLBROOK LIBRARY
Pacific School of Religion

EUSTATHIUS OF ANTIOCH

AND HIS PLACE IN THE EARLY HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Cambridge University Press
Fetter Lane, London
New York
Bombay, Calcutta, Madras
Toronto
Macmillan
Tokyo
Maruzen-Kabushiki-Kaisha

All rights reserved

EUSTATHIUS OF ANTIOCH

AND HIS PLACE IN THE EARLY HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

BY

R. V. SELLERS, B.D.

Vicar of Mytholmroyd, Yorkshire
late Scholar of St Catharine's
College, Cambridge

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Property of
CBPac
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1928

61576

BR
1720
E83
S4
1928

GMU
E291
X64

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

ο τῆς ἀληθείας πρόμαχος ὁ μέγας Εὐστάθιος

(THEODORET, *H.E.* i, 21)

CONTENTS

Preface . . . . . *page* ix

Chap. I. The Background 1

II. Eustathius' Attack on the Party of Eusebius of Nicomedia 24

III. Eustathius' Downfall 39

IV. Eustathius' Works and Exegesis 60

V. Eustathius' Teaching concerning God . . 82

VI. Eustathius' Christology 100

Index 121

PREFACE

There can be no doubt that, on account of its startling modernity, the teaching of the Antiochene theologians in the early centuries of the Church's history has no small appeal to men of the present generation. Their rationalistic method of interpreting Holy Scripture, their Christological outlook with the historical Christ in the foreground, and their insistence upon the reality of man's freedom to rise to higher things, not only strike us as being surprisingly modern, but also furnish us with those truths which it is necessary to assert in making a reasonable answer to the problems of modern thought. That Eustathius was a worthy representative of this school of thought, and that he occupied a definite place in the developing thought of the Antiochene theologians, I attempt to show in the following pages.

But the subject is of even wider importance in view of the part that Eustathius played at a most critical time in the Church's history. His prominence at the Council of Nicaea, and his attack on the principles of Arius, make it abundantly clear that he was one of the leading ecclesiastics of his day. In this respect it should be called to mind that it was not at this time that Athanasius was the chief opponent of Arianism. His later glory overshadowed those witnesses to the truth who went before him, and among these Eustathius must be counted as one who stood in the foremost rank. Although, as I think, his views were not strictly orthodox, yet in helping to establish and maintain the Nicene Definition he was a servant of God in his own generation.

Since I imagine that my conclusions concerning his orthodoxy will not meet with the support of every student of the history of Christian Doctrine, I feel that I ought to say that I approached both the man and his teaching from the traditional point of view: I regarded him, as I had been taught, as an orthodox Nicene who was vilely subjected to the intrigue of his opponents. As I pursued the subject, however, I began to feel that everything was not so straight-

forward as I had at first imagined, and, as I proceeded, I reached my present conclusions. Even then, I was not altogether satisfied; I went over the whole ground again, only to be even more convinced that, to the best of my judgment, I had arrived at a consistent interpretation of all the facts.

It remains that I should acknowledge my gratitude to those who have assisted me in my work. I would thank the Rev. Chancellor J. H. Srawley, D.D., who was one of my teachers at Cambridge, for his kindness in lending me his copy of M. Cavallera's *In Lazarum*; the book is now out of print, and copies of it appear to be very scarce. I am indebted to the Very Rev. J. C. Du Buisson, M.A., for the loan of good editions of some of the original authorities; his generosity has been of considerable help, in that, having the care of an industrial parish, I have had but little time to consult such works in the theological libraries. I have also to thank the Rev. Professor J. F. Bethune-Baker, D.D., for calling my attention to one or two points of detail. To Professor F. C. Burkitt, D.D., I (and all students of Eustathius) owe a debt of gratitude for translating some of the fragments preserved in Syriac; his translation goes to show that in all probability the fragments in question are genuine.

Finally, without the devotion and self-sacrifice of two who would be nameless, this work, whatever may be its real worth, could never have been produced. To them I owe more than words can express.

R. V. SELLERS

MYTHOLMROYD
November 1927

CHAPTER I

THE BACKGROUND

The primary object of this study is to try and reveal the position of Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch, in the Syrian tradition in the history of dogma. He lived most of his life, it would seem, in the ante-Nicene age,[1] so that chronologically he ought to be placed shortly after Paul of Samosata,[2] and some time before the later Antiochenes,[3] Flavian and Diodore, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius. Both his mode of Biblical exegesis and his doctrinal outlook make it abundantly clear that he was a true member of the Antiochene school of thought. In fact, it will be seen that what he received from his predecessors he brought nearer the truth as it was revealed to him in his own generation, and in that form bequeathed it to his successors, to become in their hands a burning and a shining light.

Although we know comparatively little concerning his life and works, there is no doubt that he was one of the most influential Bishops of the Nicene age. At the Council of Nicaea in 325 he occupied a position of special prominence, and, although we hear no more of him after his deposition some five years later, it is

[1] See below, pp. 53–56, where an attempt is made to show that in all probability he died before 337, or at any rate before 343.

[2] Paul was appointed Bishop of Antioch in 260 and definitely deprived in 272.

[3] Flavian and Diodore, when young men, cared for the spiritual welfare of the Antiochene church during the episcopates of Leontius († *c.* 357) and Meletius (360–381). Flavian, who succeeded Meletius as Bishop of Antioch, died in 404. In 378 Diodore became Bishop of Tarsus, dying in 394. Theodore, the pupil of Diodore, was born at Antioch *c.* 350, and was ordained to the priesthood *c.* 383. Ten years later he was made Bishop of Mopsuestia. He died in 428. In the same year Nestorius, who had lived in the monastery of Euprepius near Antioch, became Bishop of Constantinople. It seems that he died *c.* 452. All these were true members of the Antiochene school of thought, each interpreting the principles of the Syrian tradition in the light of his own generation.

abundantly clear that he was recognised as one of the foremost supporters of the Nicene Definition. The Church's tradition concerning him is that he was in the vanguard of the attack on Arius as soon as that unfortunate person began to proclaim his erroneous doctrines.[1] Although, so far as we can tell, he did not attack the person of Arius, the tradition is fundamentally true, for he zealously sought to expose those principles which formed the basis of the Arian system. Such principles, we shall see, were maintained by the Lucianists, who, while they were not prepared to follow Arius in all the intricacies of his doctrinal speculation, were ready to give him their support as one of their own. These, taking their name from Lucian, the saintly and gifted presbyter of Antioch, whose pupils they had been some years before, gathered round them men of kindred thought, and arrogantly promulgated their doctrines. A born fighter, Eustathius rose to the attack. At Nicaea he played his part in exposing their tenets, and for five years after his return to Antioch he fearlessly assailed their teaching and intrigue. The time came when his opponents themselves were in the ascendant, and the Bishop of Antioch was shown no mercy. Through their instrumentality he was deprived of his bishopric and condemned to banishment.

Eustathius' history, then, cannot be appreciated thoroughly without a clear understanding of the teaching of the Lucianists. The real founder of their thought was Origen, whose work as a pioneer in the realm of Christian Doctrine influenced the minds of succeeding generations of theologians. In his day the gospel had been firmly planted in the Greek world, and Origen was essentially a Greek. It is not surprising, therefore, that his view of God as the Absolute is that of Platonism, and that the terms he uses are those of the Greek philosophical schools. His system, certainly, is many-sided, but there seems no doubt that in the vastness of its author's mind it is a complete unity. For our present purpose we

[1] Thus Jerome (*Ep.* 73; *P.L.* xxii, 677): ...*Eustathium nostrum, qui primus Antiochenae ecclesiae episcopus contra Arium clarissima tuba bellicum cecinit.* Compare also the judgment of the Second Council of Nicaea: *Εὐστάθιος ὁ εὐσταθὴς πρόμαχος τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως καὶ τῆς Ἀρειανῆς κακοδαιμονίας καταλυτής* (*P.G.* xviii, 684).

may say it has two aspects. On the one hand, viewing everything *sub specie aeternitatis*, he teaches that God is eternal, and that creation is eternal. From this point of view the Son, possessing His own personal being or *hypostasis*, is always being begotten by the Father; there never was when He was not. On the other hand, he teaches that God is altogether one, incomprehensible, and unbegotten; He is the *fons et origo* of everything, the πηγὴ θεότητος. From this point of view the Son is inferior to the Father; He is certainly θεός, but He is not ὁ θεός. As we shall see, it was this latter aspect of the system which formed the basis of the Lucianists' teaching.[1]

Origen's Christology is based on his belief that all souls were created from eternity. So he teaches that the human soul of Christ, though possessing freedom like other souls, had remained pure from the beginning, and on this account was inseparably united to the Logos. With the Incarnation proper the Logos, through the medium of the soul, took to Himself a human body,

[1] Origen felt compelled to emphasise this aspect of his system against thought akin to Sabellianism. He remarks that there are some who say: μὴ διαφέρειν τῷ ἀριθμῷ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ πατρός, ἀλλ' ἓν οὐ μόνον οὐσίᾳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑποκειμένῳ τυγχανόντας ἀμφοτέρους κατά τινας ἐπινοίας διαφόρους οὐ κατὰ ὑπόστασιν, λέγεσθαι πατέρα καὶ υἱόν (*in Joh.* x, 21). Against such teaching he affirmed the distinction (even in person and substance) between the Father and the Son. Thus: ἕτερος κατ' οὐσίαν καὶ ὑποκείμενον ὁ υἱός ἐστι τοῦ πατρός (*de Orat.* 15). He even speaks of a *moral unity* between the two persons: δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πράγματα, ἓν δὲ τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ καὶ τῇ ταὐτότητι τοῦ βουλήματος (*c. Cels.* viii, 12). This aspect of the system was appropriated by most of the theologians of the East in the latter half of the third century. In their zeal to maintain against Sabellianism the personal distinctions in the Godhead, they lost sight of that other aspect which posited the Son's eternal generation. The outcome was Arianism proper, the teaching of the Lucianists preparing the way. At the same time it should be made clear that the system deliberately condemns Arian theories. In particular, Origen's doctrine of the eternal generation (comp. *in Jerem.* ix, 4: ὅτι οὐχὶ ἐγέννησεν ὁ πατὴρ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ ἀπέλυσεν αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ ἀπὸ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ ἀλλ' ἀεὶ γεννᾷ αὐτόν...καὶ ἀεὶ γεννᾶται ὁ σωτὴρ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός: moreover, he refutes Arius when he rejects, as in *de Princ.* i, 2; iv, 8, etc., the ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν) is directly opposed to the speculations of Arius. It is noteworthy that it is this latter aspect of the system which forms Origen's mighty contribution to one of the fundamental truths of Christian doctrine.

and the God-Man was set up. Human nature took upon itself the properties of the divine, and the Logos Himself, it could be said, underwent human experiences[1]. Afterwards, the human nature remained no longer, but was absorbed into the divine.[2] Despite Origen's recognition of the place of the human soul in Christ—a truth hardly reckoned with by previous theologians—it remains true that his Christology exerted no great influence on his followers. Suspicious of his doctrine concerning the pre-existence of souls[3], they fell back upon the simple teaching of the current Logos-theology. Nevertheless, even when they had discarded its fundamental principle, they could still find in their master's system authority for their assertions.

Upon his death (254 or 255), Origen's system fell to pieces. None of his admirers—and many of them occupied important sees[4]—was equal to the task of holding it together in its component parts. In particular they adopted its element of Subordinationism, feeling that they possessed therein a real bulwark against teaching which would obliterate all distinction between the Father and the Son.[5] It has been pointed out already that

[1] Comp. *de Princ.* ii, 6, 6, where we have his celebrated image of the fire and the iron. The mass of iron is so heated by the fire that, while preserving its nature, it receives all the properties of the fire, and iron and fire are one. He continues: *Hoc ergo modo etiam illa anima, quae, quasi ferrum in igne, sic semper in Verbo, Sapientia, Deo posita est, omne quod agit, quod sentit, quod intelligit, Deus est.*

[2] Comp. *c. Cels.* iii, 41 (which also illustrates Origen's teaching on the union of the two natures): *τὸ θνητὸν αὐτοῦ σῶμα καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἐν αὐτῷ ψυχὴν τῇ πρὸς ἐκεῖνον οὐ μόνον κοινωνίᾳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑνώσει καὶ ἀνακράσει τὰ μέγιστά φαμεν προσειληφέναι, καὶ τῆς ἐκείνου θεότητος κεκοινωνηκότα εἰς θεὸν μεταβεβηκέναι.*

[3] Even his followers felt compelled to correct such teaching. Thus Peter of Alexandria (300–311) wrote a work: *Περὶ τοῦ μηδὲ προϋπάρχειν τὴν ψυχὴν μηδὲ ἁμαρτήσασαν τοῦτο εἰς σῶμα βληθῆναι* (Migne, *P.G.* xviii, 520).

[4] Comp. Eusebius, *H.E.* vii, 28. Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Gregory Thaumaturgus and Athenodorus, Bishops in Pontus, Hymenaeus of Jerusalem, Theotecnus of Caesarea, and Maximus of Bostra were all Origenists.

[5] So Dionysius of Alexandria, perhaps to his sorrow, emphasised this element when he found that "the Son of God was scarcely any longer preached in the Church" (Athanasius, *de Sent. Dion.* 5). It is noteworthy that some of his sayings (*ibid.* 4, 14, 16) were produced at a later date by

they could appropriate parts of his Christology. So, to illustrate their doctrinal outlook at this period (*c.* 270) we will turn to the Statement of Belief which is contained in a letter written by six Bishops in connection with the deposition of Paul of Samosata, and to the Christological teaching of Malchion the sophist who exposed him.

It is clear from their Statement[1] that the Bishops start from the conception of God as the Absolute. He is one, unbegotten, without beginning, unchanging, and incomprehensible to human nature save in so far as He is revealed by His Son. The Son, existing before the ages, is God and Son of God in *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*. Fulfilling the paternal will, He was the agent in the creation, and He it was who appeared to the Patriarchs and Moses. Sent forth by the Father, He took flesh, which, being changelessly united to the Divinity, was deified. The Statement obviously reveals a crude form of theology, and it becomes abundantly clear that the standard set by Origen was far from being maintained by his followers. While such crude thought can scarcely be representative of the teaching of the best of Origen's followers at this period, it is altogether likely that it is characteristic of the general teaching of the age. Though it may not be expressed in so many words, there seems to be no doubt that the Bishops, in view of their conception of God, could not but look upon the Son as subordinate to the supreme being of the Father, and in their Christology they were but following current Greek thought in maintaining that the Logos had assumed flesh, without paying sufficient regard to the truth of the Lord's complete manhood.

Only a few fragments revealing Malchion's teaching have come down to us,[2] and of these very little is left to enable us to ascertain

the Arians, feeling that they had therein authority for their own theories. After all, Arianism is only Subordinationism writ large.

[1] The Statement is to be found in Hahn, *Biblioth. der Symb.* 3rd ed. p. 178 ff. The six Bishops were Hymenaeus, Theotecnus, Maximus (whom we have noted already as determined Origenists), Theophilus, Proclus, and Bolanus.

[2] Loofs in his *Paulus von Samosata* has gathered together (pp. 323–339) the original texts in connection with Paul's deposition. The above

his views concerning the relationship between the Father and the Son.[1] Yet it is legitimate to suppose that he, too, accepted the Greek conception of God, and regarded the Logos as inferior to the Father, though he upheld His eternal and personal existence. We know more of Malchion's Christological teaching. The Logos, he maintains against Paul of Samosata, is not a mere attribute but a personality, and as a personality was "personally existent" in the body of Christ.[2] He describes the manhood as *τὸ σῶμα* or *τὸ ἀνθρώπινον*, and, regarding Christ as a *σύνθεσις* of human and divine, he is not afraid to ascribe human passions to the Logos, the personality of the *σύνθεσις*.[3] Malchion's Christology may be an advancement upon the simple teaching we have seen in the Statement of the six Bishops, but it has the same Hellenic foundation. Like his predecessors, he must have found it difficult to posit the Lord's complete manhood, for he must have felt that if the Logos had assumed flesh, there could be no place for the rational soul, the Logos Himself being archetypal reason. We shall see that the Lucianists, following this type of

summary of Malchion's teaching has been drawn from this collection. It is evident that the fragments must be used carefully, for there seems to be no doubt that the later Christological controversies have there left their mark.

[1] The following passage takes us a certain way. Malchion speaks of the Son as *τὸν μονογενῆ τὸν πρὸ πάσης κτίσεως ἀϊδίως ὑπάρχοντα* (Loofs, *l.c.* p. 337).

[2] *I.e. οὐσία οὐσιωμένη ἐν σώματι*, taking *οὐσία* in the sense of personality. See Raven, *Apollinarianism*, pp. 63–65.

[3] *E.g.* Malchion is reported to have said: *Post unionem substantialem cum corpore suo humano omnia idem ipsum passum esse propter compositionem* (*σύνθεσις*) *et unionem substantialem* (*οὐσιώδης ἕνωσις*) *cum eo* (Loofs, *l.c.* pp. 88 and 336). Passages from the Synodical Letter may also be adduced, for we cannot be far wrong in assuming that Malchion agreed with its sentiments, if he was not responsible for its composition. Thus: *οὔτε δὲ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων προηγουμένως παθῶν ἀμέτοχος ἦν ὁ φορέσας καὶ ἐνδυσάμενος τὸ ἀνθρώπινον θεός. οὔτε τῶν θείων προηγουμένως ἔργων ἄμοιρον τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, ἐν ᾧ ἦν καὶ δι' οὗ ταῦτα ἐποίει. ἐπλάσθη προηγουμένως ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐν γαστρὶ, κατὰ δεύτερον λόγον θεὸς ἦν ἐν γαστρὶ συνουσιωμένος τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ* (Loofs, *l.c.* pp. 333, 334). We shall see that it is just such teaching as this which rouses Eustathius' fury. Representing a tradition which separated the natures in Christ, he railed against thought which would attribute suffering to the divine (see quotation on p. 52 below, and other quotations, pp. 112, 113).

thought, abandoned the problem and denied its existence altogether.

But this was not the only theology which prevailed in the early centuries of the Church's history. From its home in Syria there proceeded another type of teaching, established upon a totally different foundation. Whereas the former theology started from the Hellenic point of view, the starting-point of the Syrian theology was essentially Jewish. Building upon the monotheism that Israel had bequeathed to the Christian Church, it strove to make answer to the question, "What think ye of Christ?" That He was completely human the Syrian teaching was prepared to uphold in strictest terms. But what was the relationship between the manhood of Christ and the one supreme God? Here lay the question which successive generations of Syrian Christians attempted to solve. As we look back upon the first two centuries of the Church's life, we are able to discern relics of answers that were made to it. They were unsatisfactory inasmuch as, in over-emphasising the Lord's manhood, they lost sight of the truth of His divinity. Nevertheless, we believe that in their own day they were honest attempts at reaching a solution. The doctrinal teaching of the Ebionites, and that contained in the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions, may be worthless in answer to the questions of the mind and the longings of the soul, but such teaching represents a desire on the part of its upholders to express the truth which the tradition undoubtedly contains. These, it would seem, were but doctrinal experiments; the tradition reveals itself in a more developed form in the scientific theology of Paul of Samosata.[1]

About the year 260, Paul became Bishop of Antioch. Political considerations enter largely into his history, for at this time Antioch was under the rule of Zenobia, Queen of Palmyra, whom Paul served as *Procurator Ducenarius*, and when the Emperor Aurelian once more took charge of the city in 272 he was com-

[1] The evidence for Paul's teaching has been collected by Lawlor in his "Sayings of Paul of Samosata", *J.T.S.* vol. xix, No. 73, pp. 20–45, and ("Additional Notes") Nos. 74, 75, pp. 115–120. Loofs' work has been mentioned above, p. 5, n. 2.

pelled to take his departure. Fully determined to counteract the influence of Hellenic teaching,[1] he established his doctrinal system on the two momenta of the Syrian tradition, the unity of God, and the complete manhood of Jesus. He maintains that God is unipersonal, and that the Logos is an attribute of that Personality as reason (λόγος) is in the heart of man.[2] In this way, taking οὐσία in the sense of personality, he is ready to affirm that the Logos is ὁμοούσιος τῷ θεῷ,[3] and when he says that the Logos is begotten by the Father, he must be understood to mean that the Logos is then προφορικός, existing only in activity.[4] This Logos or Sophia (for he seems to use λόγος and σοφία as convertible terms), he says, inspired the prophets and especially Moses. But in Jesus it dwelt as in none before.[5] He was a man like us, though he was better in every way.[6] All through his life (if we accept the Λόγοι πρὸς Σαβῖνον as genuine)[7] by habit of love and

[1] Thus he forbade the use of hymns of this character. They were but "modern productions of modern men" (Eusebius, *H.E.* vii, 30).

[2] So Epiphanius, *Haeres.* lxv: πρόσωπον ἓν τὸν θεὸν ἅμα τῷ λόγῳ (φασὶν) ὡς ἄνθρωπον ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ λόγον (Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 37; Loofs, *l.c.* p. 338).

[3] Thus the synod which condemned him condemned also the use of ὁμοούσιος. See Hilary, *de Synodis*, 81 (Migne, *P.L.* x, 534), where this is referred to, and where he points out that Paul accepted the term *negata personarum proprietate*.

[4] ἐκεῖνον δὲ τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησεν ὁ θεὸς ἄνευ παρθένου καὶ ἄνευ τινός, οὐδενὸς ὄντος πλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ οὕτως ὑπέστη ὁ λόγος (Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 21; Loofs, *l.c.* p. 334). Compare Epiphanius (Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 37), though he is referring to Paul's followers: τὸ ὂν εἶναι (τοῦ λόγου) κατὰ τὴν προφοράν ἐστι. See also (on προφορικός) below, p. 97, n. 1.

[5] μήτε ἡ σοφία ἐν ἄλλῳ οὕτως οἰκῇ. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις ἦν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐν Μωσεῖ, καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς κυρίοις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐν χριστῷ ὡς ἐν ναῷ (Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 22; Loofs, *l.c.* p. 331). But, as Loofs maintains, the indwelling (ἐνοίκησις) was κατ' ἐνέργειαν; the Logos was in him only as a quality and not as a person. It is in this respect that the two traditions differ fundamentally. Note especially the remark in the Synodical Letter: οὐ γὰρ συγγεγενῆσθαι τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ τὴν σοφίαν, ὡς ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν, οὐσιωδῶς, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ποιότητα (Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 28; Loofs, *l.c.* p. 332).

[6] ἄνθρωπον ἡμῖν ἴσον ἔτεκεν (Μαρία), κρείττονα δὲ κατὰ πάντα, ἐπειδὴ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἐξ ἐπαγγελιῶν καὶ ἐκ τῶν γεγραμμένων ἡ ἐπ' αὐτῷ χάρις (Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 22; Loofs, *l.c.* p. 331).

[7] Harnack (*History of Dogma*, Eng. tr. iii, p. 39 n.), followed by Lawlor (*l.c.* p. 39) and Raven (*Apollinarianism*, p. 51), believes the work is genuine. On the other hand, see the forceful arguments of Loofs (*l.c.* pp. 283–

identity of will he was so united to God that finally he was made like Him. More will be said of Paul's teaching in later chapters; enough has been said at this point to make it clear that the Syrian tradition, as it is revealed in his system, was altogether different from the tradition founded on the Hellenic basis. Hence we must see in the history of Paul of Samosata the conflict between the two traditions. The work of Malchion, himself an Origenist and head of the school of Greek learning at Antioch, in exposing his tenets, and the persistence of the Origenist Bishops at the synods which were called to condemn him, amply illustrate the fact that the Hellenic tradition was seeking to oust its Syrian opponent.[1] Paul's opposition ended in his own disaster. We have yet to see how one of his successors at Antioch, "the great Eustathius," as he is called by Theodoret, carried forward the same tradition, attacked the Origenists of his own generation, and, like Paul of Samosata, met his doom.

After this introduction we should be able to appreciate the better the doctrinal position of the Lucianists. Concerning the teaching of Lucian himself, who, famed for his biblical exegesis and textual criticism, was head of a theological school at Antioch, and who died a martyr's death in the year 311, scholars have expressed different views. While Harnack[2] and Bethune-Baker[3]

293). But be this as it may, it is altogether likely that Paul maintained the προκοπή of the human Jesus (and this at any rate would imply an absolute unity of will) and, as its natural outcome, his deification. Compare the following passage from the Macrostich, which, while referring to his followers, can be taken as summing up his own teaching: οἱ ἀπὸ Παύλου τοῦ Σαμοσατέως ὕστερον αὐτὸν μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν ἐκ προκοπῆς τεθεοποιῆσθαι λέγοντες (Hahn[3], p. 193).

[1] The refutation of Beryllus of Bostra (Eusebius, *H.E.* vi, 33) shows that there had been a clash already (*c.*244) between the two traditions, and that in this case, too, the Hellenic tradition proved to be more powerful. Harnack (*l.c.* iii, 36–37) has shown that he taught a form of Dynamic Monarchianism. In this way his doctrine is akin to that of Paul of Samosata. Origen was called in, and he convinced Beryllus of his error. But it is significant that *c.*270 Maximus, a renowned disciple of Origen, was Bishop of Bostra.

[2] So he says: "This school is the nursery of the Arian doctrine and Lucian its head is the Arius before Arius" (*History of Dogma*, Eng. tr. iv, 3).

[3] *Early History of Christian Doctrine*, pp. 110, 111.

see in it the meeting-place of the teaching of Origen and that of Paul of Samosata, and so regard this as the source whence Arius, the pupil of Lucian, derived his system, Gwatkin holds that "there is really nothing against him but the leaning of his disciples to Arianism".[1] Recently, however, Loofs' investigations concerning the Pauline Schism at Antioch have brought him to the conclusion that this Lucian had no connection at all with Paul of Samosata. He would infer from an important piece of evidence which hitherto has been taken to refer to this connection, that the Lucian there referred to is another Lucian, who was Paul's episcopal successor over the Paulianists[2]. There seem to be good

[1] *Studies of Arianism*, p. 18 n.

[2] For a full discussion see his *Paulus von Samosata*, pp. 180–186. Loofs derives his evidence for the Pauline Schism at Antioch from Canon xix of the Council of Nicaea, and a passage from the petition of Basil the Deacon in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus. The former, of course, deals with the return of the Paulianists to the Catholic Church; the latter (quoted, pp. 182, 183) mentions the schisms among the people, the revolts among the priests, and the confusion among the pastors, that occurred when Paul was expelled. Then he examines the evidence of the important passage in Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 3, to which reference has been made above. It is contained in the letter of Alexander of Alexandria to his namesake of Byzantium, warning him against Arius. The Bishop of Alexandria, after declaring that the teaching of Arius is the same as that of Ebion and Artemas, and that it rivals that of Paul of Samosata, continues: ὃν διαδεξάμενος Λουκιανὸς ἀποσυνάγωγος ἔμεινε τριῶν ἐπισκόπων πολυετεῖς χρόνους. Thus Loofs understands the ὃν διαδεξάμενος Λουκιανός to refer to Lucian the episcopal successor of Paul, who was Bishop of the Paulianists during the episcopates of Timaeus, Cyril, and Tyrannus (*i.e.* till *c.* 313), and not to Lucian the martyr. He agrees that hitherto there has been deduced from the passage (the ὃν διαδεξάμενος being understood to mean that Lucian had taken over Paul's *teaching*) the fact that Lucian the martyr had been an adherent of his countryman Paul of Samosata (both came from Samosata), opinions only differing as to whether Lucian had excommunicated himself or whether he had been excommunicated by the Church. But, he goes on: "a reader who did not at once think of Lucian the martyr could only have understood this ὃν διαδεξάμενος in the ordinary sense of episcopal succession. That we are inclined to apply this observation of Alexander to Lucian the martyr is natural, for we know that Arius was his pupil and no other Lucian disturbs us in the assumption that the martyr is meant. But could it have been obvious to the recipient of Alexander's letter, the Bishop of Byzantium, that the contemptibly-treated bearer of the truly common name of Lucian was *the* Lucian, of whose martyrdom 13 years before in the neighbouring Nicomedia he must have known, and who

grounds for such a conclusion, and the result of Loofs' investigations should go far towards solving the mystery of Lucian, of whom, despite his importance, very little is known. Apart from the considerations brought forward by Loofs, it seems to the present writer that there is no need to make him the source of the Arian plague, inasmuch as Hellenic thought was already heading in that direction. But now that the way seems to have been cleared, such a conclusion becomes more certain. It would seem likely, then, that Lucian's teaching was representative of the current Logos-theology of the Greek world. The little evidence we possess is not in conflict with this judgment, and if his Confession of Faith can be accepted as genuine we have therein something like positive proof.[1]

at the time had not yet been brought into disrepute as an 'Arian martyr'? And must he have known, indeed, could he have known, that the Arius, till then hardly known to him, of whom Alexander wrote, belonged to the 'Lucianists'? Only he who ventures to say yes to these two questions may gather anything else from the remark of Alexander than this: that just as Paul was excommunicated, so also had his episcopal successor Lucian been excluded from the church during the whole of his long period of life" (p. 185). Loofs himself says that he is "firmly convinced of the correctness of the suggested interpretation of the celebrated passage" (p. 186), and if he is right, as indeed he seems to be, he has made a splendid contribution towards solving what has been hitherto nothing less than an enigma.

[1] Besides the passage from Alexander's letter, of which mention has been made already, there is the evidence of Philostorgius (of which Harnack makes much) who says (*H.E.* ii, 15) that the words ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα ("exact image"), expressing the Son's relation to the Father, were interpolated into Lucian's writings by Asterius the sophist. But the Arian Philostorgius is anxious to claim Lucian as the master for his own type of thought, and is often unreliable. There is also the evidence of the Second Creed of Antioch (341) which is ascribed to Lucian. But if it belongs to Lucian, which is extremely doubtful, it contains nothing which is distinctly Arian (compare Bethune-Baker's remark, *Early History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 175: "In the Creed itself there is probably not a single phrase which Arians could not have accepted"). Again, Epiphanius (*Anchoratus*, 33), without distinguishing between Lucian and the Lucianists, says that "Lucian and all his followers" denied the place of the human soul in Christ. We can certainly accept this testimony as fundamentally true, for if, as we think he did, Lucian thought and taught on the lines of the Logos-theology, like Malchion, he must have found it difficult to posit the Lord's complete manhood. Finally, we have his Confession of Faith, which has been preserved by Rufinus, and which

It is clear, however, that the tenets of the members of his School form the beginnings of the logical outcome of the Subordinationist teaching of Greek theologians, and that such beginnings led directly to the system of Arius. According to the lists in Philostorgius,[1] Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognius of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon, Leontius and Eudoxius, afterwards Bishops of Antioch, Athanasius of Anazarbus, Asterius the sophist, and Arius himself had all sat at the feet of Lucian. A real *esprit de corps* prevailed among them. They greeted each other as "Fellow-Lucianists",[2] and, as we shall see, when the principles of their school were in danger, they rose to a man to defend them. They were proud of their learning. They alone were wise, they said, and to them alone had been revealed truths which never before had entered into the mind of man.[3] In their arrogance, those who failed to agree with their sentiments they scorned as men unschooled and lacking in intelligence.[4] What their teaching was can be gathered from the few remaining fragments of the works of Eusebius of Nicomedia and of Asterius the sophist.

The teaching of Eusebius can be understood from his letter to Paulinus of Tyre, by which he sought to rouse him to action in support of Arius when the latter had been condemned by Alexander his Bishop.[5] Starting from the point of view of the Absolute he affirms that the unbegotten is one, and is incapable of division or change. One also is that which has come into being by Him. He is entirely distinct in nature and power, and exists

is to be found, together with other fragments, in Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iv, 1–17. If it is not genuine, it is probably largely representative of Lucian's doctrinal thought. Compare, having regard to what has been said above concerning the Logos-theology: *Errores miseratus humanos Sapientiam suam misit in hunc mundum, carne vestitam, quae nos doceret Deum;* and *Ipse qui erat immortalis, utpote Verbum et Sapientia Dei, morti se praebuit quo nobis in corpore positus patientiae praeberet exemplum.*

[1] *H.E.* ii, 14; iii, 15.

[2] συλλουκιανισταί: thus Arius addresses Eusebius of Nicomedia (Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 5).

[3] So Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, complains in his encyclical (Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 4).

[4] Thus Arius, in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia (Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 5).

[5] Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 6.

after the perfect likeness both of character and power to the Creator. The mode of His beginning is incomprehensible both to man and to superior beings. He was created, established, and begotten in the substance and in the immutable and inexpressible nature, and in the likeness which belongs to the Creator. Such teaching, he insists, is entirely scriptural, and is to be deduced from Proverbs viii, 22 (LXX). Yet he will not allow that He has come into being of the Father's substance, or that He possesses the sameness of nature.[1] There is nothing, he asserts, which is of the Father's substance, but everything which exists has been called into being at His will. As God, He stands opposed to His creation, which has been brought about through the exercising of His will, and it is clear that in that creation Eusebius includes the being of the Son.

Asterius' teaching is founded on the same conception of God. He, too, maintains that the Unoriginate is one,[2] and that in Him "as the proper power of God Himself which is natural to and co-existent with him ingenerately", there resides the impersonal Logos.[3] For the purpose of creation "when He saw that it could not endure the untempered hand of the Father", God creates the personal Logos, that "with Him as a medium all things could thereupon come into being through Himself"[4]. So the Logos, "though He is a creature and of things originate, yet as from a master and artificer has He learned to frame, and thus ministered to God who taught Him".[5] This personal Logos is to be distinguished from the Logos immanent in God.[6] He is distinct,

[1] He asserts that the fact that the Son is called "begotten" gives no ground for the belief that He is ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τῆς πατρικῆς, or that He possesses τὴν ταυτότητα τῆς φύσεως. He quotes passages of scripture (Isaiah i, 2; Deut. xxxii, 18; Job xxxviii, 28) which speak of those who are entirely unlike God by nature as begotten. For him, as for all the members of this school of thought, to beget is the same as to create. (For relics of Eustathius' attack on this position, see below, p. 52, n. 3.)

[2] Athanasius, *Orat.* i, 32.

[3] This, of course, is derived from his famous interpretation of 1 Cor. i, 24. See especially Athanasius, *de Synodis*, 18.

[4] *Orat.* ii, 24.

[5] *Orat.* ii, 28.

[6] *Orat.* i, 32.

too, from the Father.[1] Yet Asterius is ready to say that there is complete harmony between them, for what the Father wills the Son wills also.[2]

In addition, mention should be made of the little we know of the teaching of Paulinus of Tyre and Narcissus of Neronias, who, while they had not been Lucian's pupils, were in complete agreement with the Lucianists, and were ready to give them their support. Passages from the work of Marcellus of Ancyra against Asterius, which have been quoted by Eusebius of Caesarea in his *contra Marcellum*, provide us with a few details concerning the doctrinal beliefs of these two Bishops. Writing of Paulinus, whom he denounces as the spiritual father of Asterius, Marcellus says that he holds Christ to be δεύτερος θεός, and calls Him a creature (κτίσμα).[3] Narcissus, we are told, would make out that there is a first God and a second God, thus distinguishing the Logos from the Father,[4] and Marcellus, who had seen his writings, declares that he believes there are three οὐσίαι.[5]

[1] The following summarises his teaching concerning the relationship between the Father and the Son: ἄλλος μὲν γάρ ἐστιν ὁ πατὴρ ὁ γεννήσας ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ λόγον καὶ πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως (Eusebius, *c. Marcellum*, i, 4; Klostermann, *Eusebius Werke*, iv, *Gegen Marcell.* p. 19).

[2] ἐν πᾶσίν ἐστι σύμφωνος αὐτῷ (*Orat.* iii, 10). Compare the same use of συμφωνία in the fragment quoted *c. Marcellum*, i, 4 (Klostermann, *l.c.* p. 29): διὰ τὴν ἐν πᾶσιν λόγοις τε καὶ ἔργοις ἀκριβῆ συμφωνίαν ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν. It is noteworthy that the Second (so-called Lucianic) Creed of Antioch contains similar thought: τῇ μὲν ὑποστάσει τρία, τῇ δὲ συμφωνίᾳ ἕν (Hahn³, p. 186). Is it possible that Asterius was in some measure responsible for the formulary? (See also below, p. 29, n. 1.)

[3] ποτὲ μὲν δεύτερον θεὸν λέγων τὸν χριστόν, καὶ τοῦτον ἀνθρωπικώτερον γεγενῆσθαι θεόν, ποτὲ δὲ κτίσμα αὐτὸν εἶναι διοριζόμενος (*c. Marcellum*, i, 4; Klostermann, *l.c.* p. 28). In another fragment (*ibid.*) Marcellus says: ὁ Ἀστερίου πατὴρ Παυλῖνος νεωτέρους θεοὺς εἶναι ᾤετο.

[4] κατασκευάζων πρῶτον εἶναι θεὸν καὶ δεύτερον· ὡς Νάρκισσος αὐταῖς λέξεσιν γέγραφεν, and a little later in the fragment says that Narcissus διαιρεῖν δυνάμει τὸν λόγον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐθέλοι (*c. Marcellum*, i, 4; Klostermann, *l.c.* pp. 28, 29).

[5] Marcellus says he has come across a letter written by Narcissus wherein he says that he was asked by Hosius of Cordova whether, like Eusebius of Palestine, he would say there are two οὐσίαι. His writings, says Marcellus, show that his answer is that he believes there are three οὐσίαι (*c. Marcellum*, i, 4; Klostermann, *l.c.* p. 26). It is clear that Narcissus maintained the distinction between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to such an extent that Marcellus could accuse him of being a tritheist.

Now if this teaching is regarded in the light of what has been seen already of the Subordinationist teaching which prevailed in the East towards the end of the third century, it will be apparent that the thought of the Lucianists represents that same Subordinationism in a more developed form. The view of God as the Absolute is the Lucianists' starting-point, as it is that of their predecessors; the difference between them lies in the fact that the former thought fit to analyse their doctrinal position. Bringing the Son's being to the cold touch-stone of logic, it became clear to them that He is not only subordinate to the supreme being of the Father, but that He is also part of the Father's creation, created at His will. Again, going back to the foundation principle, it was self-evident that the Father could never be ἄλογος, and from this they were naturally led to posit the existence of the immanent and impersonal Logos.

Although we know very little of the Christology of the Lucianists, we can be certain of one important detail: in teaching that the Logos had assumed flesh, they denied the place of the human soul in Christ. Epiphanius tells us this,[1] and his testimony is borne out by the testimony of Eustathius himself, who deliberately charges them with being at pains to show that Christ assumed a body without a soul.[2] As we have seen, such a position was bound to come in the long run.

It was left to Arius, a presbyter of the Church of Alexandria, a member of Lucian's school, and perhaps a pupil of Eusebius of Nicomedia, to promote a full scheme of logical deductions. Being a "most expert logician",[3] he prepared a system based on the doctrinal principles of the school, and so revealed to the world their logical outcome. Like his fellow-Lucianists he starts from the fact of the Absolute. God is unbegotten, eternal, without beginning, and invisible to all beings. All that is outside Him has been created out of nothing by His will.[4] With Him, abiding in Him and co-existent with Him is the impersonal Logos. For His contact with the world He creates a second Logos, inferior

[1] *Anchoratus*, 33.
[2] *P.G.* xviii, 689 B. The fragment is quoted below, p. 51, n. 6.
[3] Sozomen, *H.E.* i, 15. [4] Athanasius, *de Synodis*, 16.

to the first. Then, from the point of view of eternity, there was once when this Logos was not; there was once when God was not Father.[1] This secondary Logos cannot know the Father perfectly, for how can the originate grasp the being of the unoriginate? Nay, He does not even know His own substance. Still, He may be called θεός, for "by participation of grace He as all others is God only in name", but He is certainly not θεὸς ἀληθινός.[2] He is a creature, though He is a perfect creature, and as such was created by the Father's will out of the non-existent.[3] This Logos assumes flesh, and, taking the place of the human soul in Christ, functions in its stead. Then, being Himself a creature, and Christ on earth being seen to have freedom of will, the Logos Himself must be capable of change. But God foreknew that He would remain good, and gave to Him beforehand that glory which He knew He would obtain as man through virtue.[4]

Was this, then, the general teaching of the Lucianists? There is no doubt that it formed the logical outcome of the principles of their school of thought, but we can hardly believe that in the early stages of the controversy the majority of the Lucianists and their supporters were prepared to go the whole way with Arius.[5] It is true they accepted his principles, for after all they were but their own, and when he was being attacked they gave him their support, feeling that the doctrinal foundation of the school was being undermined, but from what we have seen of their teaching they do not seem to have accepted all his deductions. So we can hardly call them thorough-going Arians. It was not that they were followers of Arius, but that Arius was one of their own who had launched out into the deep. Indeed, the system of Arius was stunned almost as soon as it lifted its head. Rather was it the

[1] Athanasius, *Orat.* i, 5. [2] *Orat.* i, 6.
[3] *De Synodis*, 15, 16; *Orat.* i, 5. [4] *Orat.* i, 5.
[5] Despite Athanasius' quotation from a letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia to Arius, wherein the former expresses his approval of Arius' sentiments and desires all the world to accept them (*de Synodis*, 17), it seems clear from his teaching that Eusebius was not a thorough-going Arian. The quotation is deprived of its context, and consequently should not be taken as decisive evidence.

next generation which revived Arian tenets to the fullest extent, and which at the same time brought about a gathering of those forces which eventually effected the system's downfall.

Something must now be said of the early history of the controversy. About the year 318 the teaching of Arius began to attract the attention of the Church at Alexandria, and Alexander its Bishop urged him to abandon his ideas. But Arius refused to yield, with the result that Alexander called together a council of Egyptian and Libyan Bishops at which the offending presbyter was deposed. The Bishop's attempts to restrain the spread of the controversy were now all in vain. Exiled from his city, Arius at once made his way to Caesarea where he secured the sympathy of three Syrian Bishops, Eusebius of Caesarea, Theodotus of Laodicea, and Paulinus of Tyre.[1] Holding views akin to those of the Lucianists they began at once to interest themselves in his cause, and meeting in synod decreed that Arius should be reinstated. From Caesarea he passed to Nicomedia, and on his way told the story of his conflict with Alexander. At Nicomedia he secured the help he sought. Its Bishop, "the great Eusebius", as his namesake of Caesarea calls him,[2] was one of the most influential ecclesiastics of the day. At once, therefore, being a man who "thought Church government was his affair",[3] Eusebius prepared to rouse his fellow-Lucianists and men of kindred sentiment to action. He saw quite clearly that, in expelling Arius, Alexander had made an attack upon the Lucianists' position, and he was ready to reply with all the forces at his command.

The Bishop of Nicomedia was well fitted to be "the coryphaeus of the Arian ring".[4] He was a man, says Socrates,[5] who left no stone unturned to effect his purpose. He was influential at court, and was himself probably a man of royal blood.[6] He

[1] So Alexander complains in his Encyclical: "Three Bishops of Syria, appointed no one knows how, by consenting to them (*i.e.* to Arius and his 'gang of rogues') fire them to more fatal heat" (Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 4).

[2] *c. Marcellum*, i, 4; Klostermann, *l.c.* p. 17.

[3] Socrates, *H.E.* i, 6. [4] Basil, *Ep.* 244. [5] *H.E.* ii, 8.

[6] He was probably a relative of the Emperor Julian. See *D.C.B.* ii, 362. Whether he sought the aid of Constantia, the wife of the Emperor Licinius, to effect the return of Arius, we do not know. If he did, it would seem that it availed nothing.

possessed considerable learning,[1] and to him in his position of authority Bishops paid their court. Moreover, he was capable of making use of intrigue when occasion seemed to demand it.[2] To defend the Lucianic principles he wrote letters to the Bishops of the East, explaining the sentiments of the Lucianists, and at the same time urging them, if they were in agreement, to write to Alexander and point out to him the error of his ways; or, if they could not agree, to inform him and his supporters wherein true doctrine lay[3]. It was a clever move. Most of the Eastern Bishops were Origenists, whose sympathies were naturally with Arius and the Lucianists, and Alexander's action they could only understand by setting him down as one whose policy was to maintain the dreaded teaching of Sabellius. Eusebius, too, gave the influential Bishops his special attention. He won over to his side—though one thinks he would need but little persuasion—Eusebius of Caesarea, an Origenist whose leanings were decidedly in favour of the Lucianists, and wrote to Paulinus of Tyre, urging him to declare himself and to be zealous in the cause.[4] As a result of his endeavours he gained the support of Theodotus of Laodicea, Athanasius of Anazarbus, Gregory of Berytus, Aetius of Lydda, Narcissus of Neronias, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, and Maris of Chalcedon.[5] So he summoned his forces into Bithynia, and at a synod, probably held at Nicomedia itself, the Lucianists and their supporters decreed that the Bishops should receive Arius and his *confrères* into communion, and that at Alexandria Arius should be reinstated by his Bishop. It was but the reply of the Eusebians, as we may call the party, to the Synod of Alexandria.

Despite the decree of the Synod in Bithynia, and despite the incessant letters he received from Eusebius and the Eastern

[1] Sozomen, *H.E.* i, 15. Compare also the remark of Asterius: *τὸ βάθος τοῦ νοήματος Εὐσεβίου ἐν βραχυλογίᾳ κείμενον* (*c. Marcellum*, i, 4; Klostermann, *l.c.* p. 19).

[2] Constantine denounced him as the *πρόσφυξ* of Licinius (Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 20), and his opponents never forgot how he had cast his eye upon the see of Nicomedia when he was Bishop of Berytus (Athanasius, *Apologia c. Arianos*, 6).

[3] Sozomen, *H.E.* i, 15.

[4] Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 6.

[5] Robertson, in his *Athanasius* (p. xxxiv), has some excellent comments on Eusebius and his *entourage*.

Bishops, Alexander was adamant, and positively refused to admit Arius into communion. He, too, wrote letters to the Bishops of the Orient, explaining the case, and urging them to have no dealings with Arius and his supporters. In this way, says Epiphanius,[1] he despatched some seventy letters, two of which have come down to us. Among others, Alexander wrote to his namesake of Byzantium, to Philogonius of Antioch, to Macarius of Jerusalem, and to Asclepas of Gaza. We should note especially that Eustathius, who was then Bishop of Beroea, was the recipient of one of his letters.[2] Taking later evidence into consideration, it would seem that Alexander approached those Bishops from whom he could reasonably expect support.

What, then, was the doctrinal outlook of Alexander? It appears that towards the end of the third century there prevailed among the theologians of Alexandria a tendency which sought to emphasise the Son's eternity with the Father against the Subordinationist teaching of other parts of the Orient. It was based, of course, upon that aspect of Origen's system which posited the eternal generation of the Son, and which, as we have seen, had been more or less rejected by the majority of Eastern theologians at this time. But by the members of the theological school of Alexandria it was carried forward as the corner-stone of the Church's doctrinal edifice. Thus at the outset we mark in Alexander's teaching[3] an insistence on the unity between the Father and the Son. "The Father", he says, "is always Father. And He is Father from the continual presence of the Son, on account of whom He is called Father. And the Son being ever present with Him, the Father is ever perfect, wanting in no good thing, for He did neither beget His only-begotten Son in time nor in any interval of time, nor out of the non-existent". The Father alone, he maintains, is unbegotten, but there is no separa-

[1] *Haeres.* lxix, 4. His letter to Alexander of Byzantium is to be found in Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 4. Perhaps Athanasius, then of course a young man, was responsible for the Encyclical found in Socrates, *H.E.* i, 6.

[2] Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 4 (*fin.*).

[3] His teaching can be gathered from his Encyclical in Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 4. Compare also the account given by Arius in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, *ibid.* i, 5.

tion between the Father and the Son. In fact "the idea of separation cannot even be conceived in the mind". It is not a Sonship by adoption, but one which, "naturally partaking of the paternal Divinity", is "true, peculiar, natural, and special". The Son possesses His own individual *hypostasis*, and is "immutable and unchangeable, all-sufficient and perfect, like the Father, lacking only His 'unbegotten'". We can understand, therefore, why on the one hand Alexander firmly opposed the teaching of Arius, and why on the other Arius felt constrained to question the orthodoxy of his Bishop when in his sermon on the Trinity Alexander so far insisted on the divine unity that he seemed to obliterate all distinction between the Father and the Son in the intricacies of philosophical thought.[1] But Alexander stood for the truth. It was not in teaching the subordination of the Son, but in insisting upon His essential unity with the Father that the Church could make the future of Christianity certain.

But, it would seem, it was not only the school of Alexandria which maintained the truth of the unity of God against Arius and the Lucianists. Unfortunately our evidence is very meagre, but we believe that it is possible to discern beneath it a type of Syrian teaching which had the doctrine of the divine unity as its basis. Arius in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia[2] says that all the Bishops of the East are in agreement with him save Philogonius of Antioch, Hellanicus of Tripolis, and Macarius of Jerusalem. Some of them say, he continues, that the Son is an ἐρυγή, others that He is a προβολή, and others that He is συναγέννητος. We must remember that we only have the evidence of Arius, their opponent, but his was a logical mind, and there would seem to be no reason against assuming that he had accurately summed up their position. How then could Arius arrive at such a conclusion? It is quite possible that the three Bishops did not posit the Son's *hypostasis*, but regarded as Son the impersonal power of the one Divinity. From this point of view Arius' conclusions

[1] Socrates, *H.E.* i, 5.

[2] Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 5: δίχα μόνου Φιλογονίου καὶ Ἑλληνικοῦ καὶ Μακαρίου, ἀνθρώπων αἱρετικῶν ἀκατηχήτων, τὸν υἱὸν λεγόντων οἱ μὲν ἐρυγήν, οἱ δὲ προβολήν, οἱ δὲ συναγέννητον.

logically follow. The power, inherent in God, must be *συναγέννητος*, and being put forth for the purpose of God's contact with the world must be an *ἐρυγή* and a *προβολή*. In this way, if our assumption is true, were they in line with Paul of Samosata, and from this standpoint did they uphold the unity of God against the teaching of the Lucianists. It may be heretical teaching, as Arius says, and proceed from men who held somewhat old-fashioned views, but in its insistence upon the truth of the divine unity, which seemingly constituted its foundation, we are inclined to see the continued conflict between the Syrian and Hellenic traditions.

It is impossible to say whether Philogonius openly resisted Arius, though it is certain that he refused to take his side. Philogonius died in the year 323, and, despite the fact that details concerning the Antiochene succession at this time are very unsatisfactory, most scholars agree that for a few months a certain Paulinus held the reins of office before the coming of Eustathius.[1] Jerome[2] places him between Philogonius and Eustathius, and a notice in Sozomen,[3] where he writes of Paulinus and Eustathius as Bishops of Antioch, supports his testimony. With the episcopate of Paulinus, it would seem, party-spirit ran high at Antioch. Once again our evidence is very meagre,[4] but from it we can

[1] Theodoret has no mention of him. He makes Eustathius the immediate successor of Philogonius (*H.E.* i, 7; v, 40). But perhaps this can be accounted for in that Paulinus' rule at Antioch was very brief. It is noteworthy that he omits, too, the rule of Paulinus of Tyre, who seemingly took office (but only for a short while) after the expulsion of Eustathius in 330. (See below, p. 49.)

[2] *Chronicon*; *P.L.* xxvii, 677.

[3] *H.E.* iii, 11: *ὅτι φίλος ἐγένετο* (*i.e.* Hosius, Bishop of Cordova) *Παυλίνῳ καὶ Εὐσταθίῳ τοῖς ἡγησαμένοις τῆς Ἀντιοχέων ἐκκλησίας.*

[4] The most important piece of evidence concerning Paulinus is to be found in the Synodical Letter of the Council of Philippopolis (343). It contains the following passage, with Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, as the subject: *Turpiter namque Paulino quondam episcopo Daciae individuus amicus fuit, homini, qui primo maleficiis fuerit accusatus et de ecclesia pulsus usque in hodiernum diem in apostasia permanens cum concubinis publice et meretricibus fornicetur, cujus maleficiorum libros Macedonius episcopus atque confessor a Mobso combussit* (Hilary, *Frag.* iii; *P.L.* x, 674). The mention of Paulinus as *episcopus Daciae* raises a difficulty. But perhaps, as Valesius suggests, it is a textual error which has arisen through a false reading of

surmise that the new Bishop somehow roused the ire of the Lucianists, and that through their instrumentality he was deprived of his see. It is significant that Macedonius of Mopsuestia played an important part in effecting his removal. Macedonius, as we know from his history,[1] was one of the foremost supporters of Eusebius, so it is quite likely that he of Nicomedia pulled the strings. We know nothing, unfortunately, of the dogmatic position of Paulinus, but we may reasonably conjecture from this occurrence that he was one who, like Philogonius, insisted upon the unity of God against the tenets of the opposing party. It is true that he was convicted of witchcraft, but it should be remembered that the Eusebians were often ready to make out a case concerning the vices of Bishops even when they had no grounds for their accusation.[2]

an abbreviated form of *Antiochiae*. The context (particularly the mention of Paulinus as the friend of Hosius) almost demands that we should fit it in with the notice in Sozomen (see p. 21, n. 3 above). At the same time it must be admitted that the problem of Paulinus is difficult to solve satisfactorily. In fact Loofs attempts to make the evidence admit of quite a different construction. He suggests, as a "possibility for discussion", that Paulinus, *episcopus quondam Daciae*, having been *there* accused of "magic", was banished from the Church, and that afterwards he became Bishop of Paulianists at Antioch after the death of Lucian (see above, p. 10), retiring after an understanding with Eustathius, and remaining for some time in league with Hosius, who had got into touch with him perhaps at Antioch itself. (For a full discussion, see his *Paulus von Samosata*, pp. 186–192.) But perhaps Loofs has been unduly influenced by his principal theme of the Pauline Schism, and his desire to discover Lucian's successor as Bishop over the Paulianists. So he sees in Paulinus just the one needed to fill in the gap between the death of Lucian and the settlement at Nicaea (Canon xix), and thus arrives at the conclusion that perhaps Paulinus retired in favour of Eustathius as Bishop of the united parties. It is certainly an ingenious piece of reconstruction, but after all there is no direct evidence to show that Paulinus was Bishop of the Paulianists, and greater difficulties are entailed in this assumption than in the assumption that he was Catholic Bishop of Antioch, and the determined opponent of the Eusebian party.

[1] See Art. "Macedonius", *D.C.B.* iii, 775.

[2] If the records are trustworthy, perhaps on account of this party spirit a Council was held to restore peace. (See Synodical Letter, which conveys nothing, together with a list of signatures in Labbe, Tom. ii, p. 559). Through its efforts, whatever they were, peace was restored. How this came about we are not told. Did the Council effect the peace

Thus it remained for Eustathius to leave Beroea for Antioch, and there to continue the work of Philogonius and Paulinus in witnessing to the truth of the Syrian tradition.

through the removal of Paulinus and the establishment of Eustathius? Or did Paulinus retire of his own accord? or was Eustathius already in office when the Council was held? These are questions it is impossible to answer. Neither does it seem that the newly discovered Synodical Letter, first published by Schwartz in 1905, can help us to solve these difficulties. Though it is defended by Schwartz himself, and after him by Seeburg, both Harnack and Loofs (*Paulus von Samosata*, p. 193) are more than doubtful of its authenticity. The letter, signed by some fifty-six Bishops, the majority of whom presumably hailed from the provinces of the Orient, is addressed to Alexander, "the Bishop of New Rome". But the new capital was not founded till late in 326, and since forty-nine of the fifty-six names appear in the Nicene lists, it is possible that they were taken from that source. The letter itself informs us that in the Church of Antioch at this time party spirit was rife, and "ecclesiastical law and the canons" were being set at nought. So the assembled Synod first discussed the faith of the Church, considered what Alexander of Alexandria had done against the Arians, and formulated a Creed, based on Alexander's letter, to defend the faith against their teaching. The Synod also, we are told, temporarily excommunicated Theodotus of Laodicea, Narcissus of Neronias, and Eusebius of Caesarea, because their views were in agreement with those of the Arians. But the general sentiments of the letter leave one with the impression that, as it stands, it is the product of a later age. Burn, in his lecture (see below, p. 88, n.), is ready to support its authenticity. Thus he sees "a strong proof of genuineness" (p. 5 of his lecture) in the letter's omission of the term *Homoousios*, but this carries little weight inasmuch as the word could easily have been omitted purposely. Moreover, there is no need to see in "the unmasking of Eusebius" (p. 6) the explanation of his bitter hostility against Eustathius in 330, seeing that the latter for some time had been openly flouting Origen's name (see his epithets in the *de Engastrimytho*, written, presumably, well before 325)—and Eusebius regarded Origen as his patron—and had deliberately assumed the offensive against him and his associates after the Council of Nicaea in 325. But in any case the problem is most perplexing, and awaits further serious consideration. All we can say at the moment is that perhaps a Council was called at this time (late in 324 or early in 325) to settle an Antiochene disturbance, and that with the disturbance it is possible that Paulinus had some connection.

CHAPTER II

EUSTATHIUS' ATTACK ON THE PARTY OF EUSEBIUS OF NICOMEDIA

Of the history of Eustathius before the summoning of the Council of Nicaea we know scarcely anything. Jerome, in his *de Viris Illustribus*,[1] tells us that he was a Pamphilian from Side, and from Athanasius and Theodoret we learn that he was a Confessor.[2] He became Bishop of Beroea (the modern Aleppo) in Syria, and, as we have noticed already, while occupying that see, heard by letter from the Bishop of Alexandria of the activities of Arius. In the year 324, or early in 325, he was translated to Antioch.[3] In the summer of 325, but a few months after his appointment, he was called to Nicaea, there to take part in the Council's deliberations. It is at this point that we must mark the beginnings of his attack on the party of Eusebius of Nicomedia.

Eusebius of Caesarea, in his *Life of Constantine*,[4] gives us a picturesque account of the formal opening of the Council. He tells us that the Bishops were seated in order of rank in two rows

[1] Ch. 85.

[2] Athanasius, *Hist. Arian.* 4 and *Apol. de Fuga*, 3. Theodoret, when quoting from his works often describes him thus in his *Dialogues*. Compare also, Eustratius the presbyter in the sixth century, *P.G.* xviii, 689 B, and the title of the three fragments from Eustathius' *de Anima contra Philosophos*, *P.G.* lxxxvi, 2, 2037. In both cases he is alluded to as a Confessor. Whether he confessed the faith in the persecution of Diocletian or in that of Licinius, we do not know.

[3] It is just possible that Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, who had come into the East with Constantine in 323, and who had begun to interest himself in its ecclesiastical affairs, was partly responsible for the appointment. We have seen already (p. 11, n. 3) that he and Eustathius were friends. Compare also the Synodical Letter of the Council of Philippopolis (343): *His itaque ac talibus* (*i.e.* Eustathius and Kymatius of Paltus) *junctus ab initio Ossius* (*P.L.* x, 674). It is clear that Sozomen (*H.E.* i, 2) is mistaken when he says that Eustathius was elected at Nicaea, though it is possible that the appointment was confirmed by the Council.

[4] iii, 10.

on each side of the hall of the palace,[1] and that upon the majestic entrance of Constantine they rose in their places and waited until he had taken his seat in the midst, at the upper end of the hall. Then they sat down, and, Eusebius goes on to say: "The Bishop who occupied the chief place in the right division of the assembly then rose, and, addressing the Emperor, delivered a concise speech in a strain of thanksgiving to Almighty God on his behalf".[2] Can we say which Bishop it was who had the honour of delivering this inaugural address? It is not easy to give a decided answer, but on the whole we feel inclined to give the honour to Eustathius.[3] Let us look at the evidence.

Most scholars have followed Sozomen,[4] and have said that Eusebius of Caesarea delivered the address. No doubt he was well fitted to compose the panegyric, and it is certain that he delivered the address at the Emperor's *Tricennalia* in 335, but we do not imagine that he "occupied the chief seat in the right division of the assembly". Antioch was the third city of the Roman Empire, following Rome and Alexandria, and seeing that Rome was only represented by presbyters, it would seem almost a foregone conclusion that the representative of the Antiochene see took a foremost position in virtue of his rank. Moreover, we have the direct evidence of Theodoret who says that Eustathius "crowned the Emperor's head with the flowers of panegyric",[5] and when we add to this the fact that he is referred to as having been *primus* at the Council, we have good grounds for saying that in all probability he delivered the oration in the Emperor's honour.[6] To draw a bow at a venture, we would suggest that Hosius his friend was largely responsible for the choice.

The oration concluded, the Emperor rose and addressed the

[1] More or less informal gatherings had taken place previously. See Socrates, *H.E.* i, 8, and Sozomen, *H.E.* i, 17. Perhaps these had been held in the local church.

[2] *Life of Constantine*, iii, 11.

[3] Bardenhewer takes this view in his *Gesch. der altkirchlichen Literatur*, ii, 231, 232.

[4] *H.E.* i, 19.

[5] *H.E.* i, 7.

[6] The *Allocutio ad Constantinum* (*P.G.* xviii, 673), which is attributed to him, and which has come down to us through Gregory, a presbyter of Caesarea in Cappadocia in the tenth century, is certainly spurious. See below, pp. 60, 61.

assembly in Latin, pleading for unity, peace, and concord. Then: *παρεδίδου τὸν λόγον τοῖς τῆς συνόδου προέδροις*.[1] Who, then, were the *πρόεδροι*? They were hardly presidents, in our sense of the word. The real president was the Emperor, and so he remained to the end of the deliberations, but, having little knowledge of Greek, he was compelled to hand over the direction of the business to others who were familiar with the subjects under discussion. Can we say who these were? We have no definite record, but we think we shall not be wrong in giving the first place to Hosius. He had already made himself conversant with the doctrinal controversy.[2] Besides, at this time, the Emperor placed his confidence in him, and both Athanasius and Theodoret affirm his prominence at Nicaea.[3] Having given first place to Hosius, we think we can well include others among the *πρόεδροι*. Without a doubt Eustathius was one of the foremost among them. John of Antioch alludes to him as *...beatissimum Eustathium, qui sanctorum patrum, qui apud Nicaeam congregati, primus exsistens fidem orthodoxam confirmavit*,[4] and Facundus says he was *primus in Nicaeno concilio*.[5] Moreover, in one of his *Epistles*, Theodoret says he presided at the assembled council.[6] Besides Eustathius, Alexander of Alexandria almost certainly,[7] and perhaps Macarius of Jerusalem in virtue of the dignity of his see, are to be numbered among the *πρόεδροι*.[8] Under the leadership of Hosius they were directly responsible for the doctrinal decisions of the Council.

[1] *Life of Constantine*, iii, 13.

[2] Compare Athanasius, *Apol. c. Arianos*, 74, and Socrates, *H.E.* iii, 7.

[3] Athanasius, *de Fuga*, 5, and *Hist. Arian.* 42; Theodoret, *H.E.* ii, 15.

[4] Cited by Facundus, *P.L.* lxvii, 711.

[5] *Defence of the Three Chapters*, xi, 1 (*P.G.* xviii, 692 c).

[6] *Ep.* 151: *Εὐστάθιος ὁ μέγας ὁ τῆς συναθροισθείσης συνόδου πρωτεύσας* (*P.G.* lxxxiii, 1440).

[7] In the Synodical Letter (Socrates, *H.E.* i, 9) he is alluded to as *κύριος καὶ κοινωνὸς τῶν γεγενημένων*.

[8] Athanasius, we must remember, was but chief deacon (*τοῦ χοροῦ τῶν διακόνων ἡγούμενος*, says Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 26). Socrates (*H.E.* i, 23) is assuming too much, we think, when he says he withstood Eusebius and his following at the Council. We can hardly think he took an important part in the debate. He himself, when alluding to the proceedings, speaks of "the Bishops" (compare *de Decretis*, 19, 20, and *ad Afros*, 5).

Unfortunately we possess no authentic record of the Acts of the Council, so that we are compelled to fall back upon the testimony of eye-witnesses and that of the ancient historians. It is on this account, therefore, that the testimony of Eustathius is of particular value. Writing concerning the Council in his *Homily on Proverbs viii*, 22 (LXX), which he composed between 325 and 330, he says:

I will now pass on and relate the outcome. A General Council was summoned at Nicaea, where about 270 Bishops were convened. (There were however so many assembled that I cannot state their exact number; neither indeed have I taken any great trouble to ascertain this point.) Now when discussion commenced upon the definition of the faith, the statement of Eusebius' blasphemous false teaching came under consideration—a clear proof, surely, of his heresy. And when it was read in the presence of all the assembly, at once it caused the hearers to shudder with grief on account of its heterodoxy, while it brought everlasting disgrace upon its writer. Now after the mark of the Eusebian workshop had been clearly detected, the impious statement being torn into shreds in the sight of all, certain of them, upon agreed design, made peace their pretext and silenced those who generally made the best speeches. Then the Ariomaniacs, fearing lest they should be ostracised in the presence of so great a gathering, leapt to their feet, anathematised the forbidden doctrine, and with their own hand signed the documents agreed upon by all.[1]

At the outset, we should take note of two facts. First, Eustathius does not intend to give us a detailed account of the proceedings of the Council; he is but seeking to reveal the intrigue of the Eusebians. Secondly, he is a man of passion, full of fire against his adversaries; his, therefore, is a somewhat prejudiced view, written in a superlative tone.[2] Having made these preliminary observations we can arrive at the bare facts. The Creed of Eusebius was presented,[3] deliberation ensued upon it, and then

[1] *P.G.* xviii, 676. The remaining part of the fragment is quoted below, pp. 35, 36.

[2] Compare, for example, his use of *συμφορὰν ἀστάθμητον*, *αἰσχύνην ἀνήκεστον*, and *παρανόμου γράμματος* in the original. Moreover, we should take into account the impulsive character of the author.

[3] The Greek (*προὐβάλλετο*) is not decisive. Hence it is possible that the *πρόεδροι* brought it forward to reveal the position of the Lucianists

it was torn up. After this, the party of Eusebius remained silent to the end of the proceedings, when they signed the Creed agreed upon by the assembly.

The question arises: Can we discover the character of the Eusebian Creed? It is generally agreed that this Creed represented a thorough-going Arianism, and on this account was torn up at once.[1] The consistent opinion of scholars makes one hesitate before bringing forward another suggestion for which one cannot adduce positive evidence. Nevertheless, perhaps more from the point of view of probability than of actual proof it may be felt that the suggestion is worthy of consideration. It is difficult to imagine that the worldly-wise Eusebius of Nicomedia produced a creed of such a character, even if he held with all the deductions of the Arian system. But we have tried to show above that the Lucianists and men of kindred sentiment were not prepared to follow Arius all the way. We would surmise, therefore, that the Creed of Eusebius represented the thought of the Lucianic school. It is just possible that relics of the formulary are to be found in the testimony of Athanasius concerning the discussions at Nicaea. Athanasius tells us that the Eusebians were called upon to explain their opinions, and elsewhere speaks of their evasive

and their adherents. But it seems more probable that it was introduced by the Eusebian party in their attempt to give a Creed to Christendom, for the Council, presumably, was seeking a formulary which could be accepted by all. The Eusebians, therefore, made their contribution, only to meet with disaster.

[1] But it seems that Theodoret's account of the Council's proceedings at this point (*H.E.* i, 7)—which forms the evidence for this view—is altogether dependent on the testimony of Eustathius. He says that the few who sided with Arius (such as Menophantus, Patrophilus, Theognius, Narcissus, Theonas and Secundus) drew up a creed of (their) faith and presented it to the Council, and that as soon as it was read it was torn up as "spurious and false", tumult being caused on account of its "betrayal of true religion". It is clear that Theodoret has made his inferences from the Eustathian record, but it is also clear that he has treated the account literally instead of making allowances for its superlative tone. It would be a mistake, we think, to lay any great stress on Eustathius' *αὐτίκα* or on his description of the *γράμμα*. He was a man who did not fear to use scathing words against his adversaries, and in this case, writing against their intrigue, after the Council, his animosity is quite apparent.

answers when they were questioned by the Bishops.[1] Their creed, it would seem, formed the basis of the discussion, and perhaps phrases from it are to be found in their answers. We are ready to acknowledge that we are treading upon dangerous ground where there are no landmarks, but it does not seem too much to see beneath the records, evidence—though it may be very small—for a Eusebian creed representative of that party's school of thought.

This will help us to understand more clearly the attack that was made on the Eusebians at Nicaea, and the part that was played by Eustathius. We have already seen that Constantine handed over the business of the Council to the *πρόεδροι*, and we have attempted to say who these were. The point we would now emphasise is that they were steadfast in maintaining the doctrine of the divine unity. Hosius had come from the West where the *una substantia* was firmly secured; Alexander on the one hand, and Eustathius (and, perhaps, Macarius[2]) on the other, although,

[1] In *de Decretis*, 3, Athanasius says that the Eusebians were called upon to defend themselves. In *de Decretis*, 19 and 20, and in *ad Afros*, 5, we are told that they could accept certain phrases, placing upon them their own interpretation. These phrases were *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ*, *ὅμοιος*, *ἀεί*, *δύναμις*, *ἐν αὐτῷ*, *ἄτρεπτος* and *ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκών*. We would suggest that these phrases, together with terms like *λόγος*, *σοφία*, *θεός* (on the basis of the Bishops' doctrinal declarations in *de Decretis*, 19, 20 and *ad Afros*, 5), found a place in the Eusebian formulary. It is possible, too, that it contained the well-used phrase, *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*. Perhaps is was akin to the Lucianic Creed of Antioch (341), and perhaps it was drawn up by Asterius the sophist. The phrase *ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκών* is to be found in the so-called Lucianic Creed and in a fragment from the works of Asterius which in many respects resembles that Creed (*c. Marcellum*, i, 4; Klostermann, *l.c.* p. 25). When we remember that Asterius was the *συνήγορος* of the Eusebian party (Athanasius, *Orat.* iii, 2) the suggestion seems to gather more weight. It is true that the same phrase is used by Alexander (Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 4) and by Athanasius (*Orat.* i, 26; ii, 33; iii, 5) but this can be accounted for by the fact that both sides derive it from the common source of Origen's teaching. It will be apparent that if we can accept this suggestion, much light is thrown on the later history of Eustathius. At Nicaea he was prominent against the party of Eusebius, and through his energies they suffered shame. In 330, when that party assumed the offensive, they avenged the defeat they had suffered in 325 through effecting his deposition.

[2] See above, pp. 20, 21.

we believe, regarding it from different points of view, were zealous in maintaining that truth. When, therefore, the Creed of Eusebius was presented, it was at once subjected to their scrutiny. Questions were asked,[1] and evasive replies were made. It was seen that the Creed not only opened the door to the blasphemies of Arius, but deliberately closed it against the principle the leaders would affirm. The time came when, under the fire of the Bishops' questions, the Eusebian party could hide its face no longer. Its members abandoned the struggle, thinking it politic to remain silent. Calling to mind the impulsive character of Eustathius we can well believe that he was one of the first to tear the offending statement into shreds. It was a blow which the Eusebians soon sought to avenge.

There is little to be said concerning the rest of the Nicene proceedings. After the Eusebian party had been put to silence, Eusebius of Caesarea presented the Baptismal Creed of his Diocese, but, *προφάσει τοῦ 'ὁμοουσίου,'* he complains,[2] the Bishops drew up another creed. It is perfectly clear that the leading Bishops could see loopholes for Eusebian and Arian evasion in the Caesarean Creed as it stood. Therefore were they determined that before all others one word should be inserted in the revised creed. That word, *ὁμοούσιος*, they knew, would safeguard the truth of the divine unity.[3] So they emended the text of Eusebius' Creed, and this in its new form was signed by almost all the assembled Bishops. Eusebius himself asked questions, and then gave his consent; his namesake of Nicomedia

[1] It is probable that, along with the Bishops already mentioned, Marcellus of Ancyra took an important part in the discussion (Athanasius, *Apol. c. Arian.* 23 and 32).

[2] Eusebius' Letter to his Diocese, Socrates, *H.E.* i, 8.

[3] At the same time it is clear that, while insisting upon the divine unity of the Father and the Son, the Nicenes found it difficult to express the Son's personality in the Godhead. It is true they included the *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός*, but this is not decisive. Marcellus regarded *ὁμοούσιος* from the point of view of the uni-personality of the Godhead, and we believe Eustathius did the same, though his was not the doctrinal outlook of Marcellus. Perhaps Macarius thought in a somewhat similar way (see above, pp. 20, 21). Even Alexander, despite the fact that he was ready to uphold the Son's personal existence, seems to have experienced the difficulty in his sermon on the Trinity (see above, p. 20).

also signed after some delay. Arius was banished, and the Church now possessed a statement of belief which had been universally accepted. Then could not the Emperor expect peace?

The peace, however, that Constantine both desired and deserved was not forthcoming. Nicaea in reality meant the victory of a mere handful of Bishops who, with the support of the Emperor,[1] had defeated all opposition, had swayed the majority,[2] and had given Christendom a Creed after their own liking. Dissatisfaction prevailed on account of ὁμοούσιος, and the majority of the Bishops of the East, if they were interested in doctrinal questions, came to see that they had signed something which, when they went to Nicaea, they had not the slightest intention of signing. It became apparent that the word, which had been inserted in the Creed to defeat the inroads of Arianism, still left open the door to the opposite error of Sabellianism which they abhorred, for, while they were not Arians, they were certainly not Sabellians. And, assuredly, they had reason to complain, for they knew that Marcellus of Ancyra must have accepted the word in a Sabellian sense at the Council, and he was still advocating his doctrines. So after 325 there came a period of unrest. The supporters of ὁμοούσιος denounced its adversaries as Arians, and the latter retaliated by denouncing the former as followers of Sabellius. As Socrates says, the contest was not unlike a struggle in the dark, "for neither party appeared to understand distinctly the grounds on which they calumniated one another".[3]

To illustrate this general unrest, and at the same time to confirm the main thought of the chapter, something may well be said at this point of the quarrel between Eustathius and Eusebius

[1] It is clear that Constantine took the side of the small minority, and the assembly had no desire to offend the first Christian Emperor. His plea for the insertion of ὁμοούσιος (see Eusebius' Letter to his Diocese in Socrates, *H.E.* i, 8) must have done much towards bringing the Bishops to a decision in its favour.

[2] But perhaps the majority of the Bishops at Nicaea were more interested in their *libelli* (Socrates, *H.E.* i, 8; Sozomen, *H.E.* i, 17) than in important matters of doctrine.

[3] Socrates, *H.E.* i, 23; Sozomen, *H.E.* ii, 18.

of Caesarea concerning ὁμοούσιος.[1] Although doctrinal matters formed the basis of the dispute there seems no doubt that other considerations served to intensify its bitterness. It is quite possible that one of the decisions made at Nicaea, and embodied in Canon vi,[2] was responsible for much of the animosity which each Bishop displayed. The Council had decided that the Bishop of Antioch, in virtue of the importance of his see, should have ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the fifteen provinces of the Orient, and of these Palestine, with its Bishop at Caesarea, was one. We can imagine that the old Adam in Eusebius rose against this indignity, and no doubt he would use every opportunity to show the new Bishop of Antioch that he was a power to be reckoned with. Moreover, Eustathius' attitude towards Origen would not improve matters. He stood out as one of the foremost of Origen's opponents in that day, and he did not fear to cast many a slur upon the man's scholarship and influence.[3] To Eusebius, his

[1] Accounts of the quarrel are given by Socrates and Sozomen (*ibid.*). It is noteworthy that, to say the least of it, there was some correspondence probably about this time between Eusebius and Euphration of Balaneae (Athanasius, *de Synodis*, 17). Perhaps Euphration was a supporter of Eustathius (Balaneae was not far, geographically, from Antioch), though this must remain a pure conjecture seeing we only possess this small piece of evidence. Nevertheless, in his attack on the Eusebian party we do not think Eustathius stood alone. It is to be noted that several Syrian Bishops (among whom was Euphration) met their doom with him *c.* 330 (*Hist. Arian.* 5).

[2] See Hefele, *Councils*, i, 388 ff. Comp. Venables, art. 'Eustathius' in *D.C.B.*

[3] Thus in his sarcasm he speaks of him as: ὁ κομψὸς Ὠριγένης (25. 20), ὁ δογματιστὴς Ὠριγένης (28. 23; 37. 2), ὁ μεγαλήγορος Ὠριγένης (57. 10), ὁ πολυΐστωρ Ὠριγένης (62. 14), and ὁ πολύφημος Ὠριγένης (63. 25). He addresses him, ὦ βέλτιστε δογματιστά (32. 5) and ὦ ἀνοητότατε ἀνδρῶν (64. 2). He accuses him of thirsting for popularity (22. 9; 66. 14). In respect of his interpretation of the story of the Witch of Endor he denounces him as one who would support the practice of magic (32. 13; 58. 6), addressing him, ὦ τῆς ἀθεμίτου μαντείας ὑποθήμων (30. 7). He must be "plagued with sheer lack of understanding", he says, if he believes the words of a demented woman (52. 21). That Samuel was in Hades he "repeats time and time again like an old woman" (53. 20). He "thinks he has interpreted all the Scriptures" but he conveniently fails to bring into account those passages which do not suit his purpose (68. 23 ff.). He makes use of a "deceitful device" when he flies to the Person of Christ, and his opinion concerning Him is quite in keeping

foremost admirer, this would be something almost amounting to sacrilege, and, in his loyalty, his master's foe would become his foe too.

Leaving these considerations on one side, and entering more fully into the doctrinal aspect of the quarrel, it should be noted that in attacking Eusebius Eustathius was in reality attacking the principles of the Lucianists, for the teaching of Eusebius is quite consistent with them. For him God is the *πρῶτον αἴτιον*, who for His contact with the world begat the Son at His will.[1] So the Son is *δεύτερος θεός*, the *δημιούργημα* and *ἀρχιτεκτόνημα* of God for the creation.[2] He has a *hypostasis* of His own, yet the Father's is prior to it.[3] Thus, according to Eusebius, the Son is God only in a derived sense,[4] and, so far as one can see, the Council of Nicaea did little, if anything, to change his outlook.[5] He left the Council somewhat disappointed that Caesarea had not given its Creed to Christendom, and for the most part

with one who holds that prophetic souls were brought up by a demon (53. 27; 57. 5). He must be more demented than the woman herself (57. 20) if he thinks that angels were under the authority of a demon. He repeats his nonsense many times over (69. 11), and, failing to understand the meaning of the name "Engastrimythus", he must be convicted of stupidity (70. 21). [The numbers above refer to the pages and lines in Jahn's edit. of Eustathius' *de Engastrimytho* (*Texte und Unters.* ii, 4).]

[1] The Father is *τῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ συστάσεως αἴτιος* (*Dem. Ev.* iv, 3). The Son cannot be eternal, for *ἀΐδιον τουτέστιν ἀγέννητον* (*c. Marcellum*, ii, 2). So He owes His existence to the Father's will: *βουληθεὶς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς γέγονεν υἱοῦ πατήρ* (*Dem. Ev.* iv, 3).

[2] *Dem. Ev.* iv, 2. Compare also *de Eccl. Theol.* i, 8: *ἔπρεπεν γὰρ τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων θεῷ πρὸ παντὸς γεννητοῦ καὶ πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων τὸ μονογενὲς τοῦτο προβαλέσθαι γέννημα, ὥσπερ τινὰ κρηπῖδα καὶ θεμέλιον ἀρραγῆ τῶν μελλόντων δι' αὐτοῦ γενήσεσθαι.*

[3] *ὁ δὲ πατὴρ προϋπάρχει τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ προϋφέστηκεν* (*Dem. Ev.* iv, 3).

[4] Though he may say *υἱὸν θεοῦ μονογενῆ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν (ἡ ἐκκλησία) παραδίδωσιν, τὸν πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεγεννημένον, οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν ὄντα τῷ πατρί, καθ' ἑαυτὸν δὲ ὄντα καὶ ζῶντα καὶ ἀληθῶς υἱὸν συνόντα, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς καὶ ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς...*(*de Eccl. Theol.* i, 8), such thought should be considered in relation to such a passage as *εἷς δὲ καὶ μονογενὴς τοῦ θεοῦ υἱός, εἰκὼν τῆς πατρικῆς θεότητος, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο θεός* (*ibid.* i, 2).

[5] One has only to read his *contra Marcellum* and his *de Ecclesiastica Theologia*, both of which were written after the Council, to be assured that this is true.

suspicious of the term which, through the instrumentality of a few leading Bishops, had found its way into the Nicene Definition. In this frame of mind he was prepared to combat any thought which would seem to obliterate the distinction between the Son and the Father. Already moved to enmity, he began to pay particular attention to the teaching of Eustathius, and found therein an insistence upon the unity of God which to his mind imperilled the Son's personal existence. He accused Eustathius of introducing the opinion of Sabellius, and Eustathius retaliated by denouncing him as a perverter of the Nicene faith.[1] So they were never at peace.[2] Whether the Bishop of Caesarea was right in thus condemning his rival we shall discuss in a later chapter. Enough has been said here to assure us that Eustathius on his side had no uncertain grounds for complaint. It is quite clear that in the quarrel between the two Bishops we must mark the conflict between two traditions, for Eustathius was but upholding the doctrinal principles of the Syrian tradition against the subordinationist teaching of Eusebius. It was but a form of his general attack on the party of Eusebius of Nicomedia.[3]

[1] It is clear that Socrates (*H.E.* i, 23) has altogether misunderstood the doctrinal aspect of the quarrel. He says that they wrote against each other "as against adversaries", and confesses that he cannot understand why they did not agree, since both of them maintained the personal existence of the Son and one God in three *hypostases*. Thus he believes that both were orthodox. We shall see later on that while Eustathius upheld the *μία θεότης*, he failed to posit the Son's personal existence, and enough has been said above to show that Eusebius was but following the subordinationist teaching of the East. The quarrel is easily understood if due regard is paid to the personal and doctrinal aspects of the case.

[2] Eusebius must have experienced something of the violent hostility of Eustathius, for, writing some years afterwards concerning his opponent, he says that he has no desire to recall past grievances (*Life of Constantine*, iii, 59; quoted below, p. 42). He had no need to do so, for he had won the day, and Eustathius was in banishment. Jerome (*de Viris Illust.* 85) refers to the large number of Eustathius' letters which were extant in his day. Perhaps some of them were written in connection with the dispute, though this of course is a pure conjecture.

[3] Although Eusebius gave his support to Arius and Eusebius of Nicomedia before the Council (thus Eusebius of Nicomedia speaks of *ἡ τοῦ δεσπότου μου Εὐσεβίου ἡ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς λόγου* in his letter to Paulinus, Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 6) it would be wrong to say that he was a confirmed member of the Eusebian party. His sympathies certainly

Though deprived of their leader, who had been banished into exile only three months after the Council of Nicaea,[1] the Eusebians still continued to assert their doctrines, and to attempt to undermine the victory which had been gained by the small minority in 325. Perhaps at this time we may place the "missionary journey" of Asterius the sophist. He had composed a Συνταγμάτιον, and, armed with letters of introduction from the Eusebian Bishops, went round the churches of Syria reading his production.[2] The work, of course, was in keeping with the general tenets of the party. Nor do we imagine that Paulinus of Tyre, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, and Theodotus of Laodicea failed to use the opportunity of expressing their dissatisfaction at what had happened at Nicaea.[3] No doubt they were ready to denounce the Syrian supporters of the ὁμοούσιος as followers of Sabellius, and no doubt the majority of the Eastern Bishops were ready to lend them a sympathetic ear. Thus were they sowing seeds which were to bring forth fruit in due season; when Eusebius returned he could put forth his sickle, and reap a harvest after his own liking.

This state of things is well described by Eustathius himself:

Thus having retained possession of their episcopal seats through the most shameful deception, although they ought rather to have been degraded (*i.e.* at Nicaea), they continue, sometimes secretly, sometimes openly, to patronise the condemned doctrines, plotting

went out to them, but his was the more conservative teaching which enabled him to lead the conservatives, the vast majority of Eastern Bishops, at Nicaea.

[1] He and Theognius had admitted certain Arians of Alexandria into communion after the Council, and the Emperor, perhaps influenced by the Nicene party, had ordered his banishment (Sozomen, *H.E.* ii, 21). It is possible that an unsuccessful attempt was made to secure his banishment at the Council itself (see letter of Constantine to Nicomedians, Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 20).

[2] Athanasius, *de Synodis*, 18, gives us quotations from the work. These we have used above when writing on the teaching of Asterius (pp. 18, 19). There seems to be no reason against placing the intrigue of Asterius after the Council. It certainly fits in with what Eustathius says of the conduct of the Eusebians.

[3] Eustathius at this time accused Paulinus and Patrophilus of favouring the heresy of Arius (Sozomen, *H.E.* ii, 19). No doubt their conduct as well as their teaching prompted him to do so.

against the truth by various arguments. Wholly bent upon establishing these plantations of tares, they shrink from the scrutiny of the intelligent, avoid the observant, and attack the preachers of godliness. But we do not believe that these atheists can ever thus overcome the Deity. For though they "*gird themselves*" they "*shall be broken in pieces*", according to the solemn prophecy of Isaiah.[1]

Eustathius was not the man to sit quietly and see his adversaries undermining the position for which he had so valiantly fought at Nicaea. He certainly had the courage of his convictions, and possessed therewith a fiery temper and a lashing tongue, which he did not fail to use as occasion arose. At a time, then, when the Eusebians were seeking to prejudice him and his teaching in the eyes of the Bishops of Syria, he took up his pen and wrote his *Homily on Proverbs viii*, 22, their *locus classicus*, denouncing his opponents as Ariomaniacs, atheists and sycophants.[2] Though Theodoret has preserved but fifteen short fragments from the *Homily*, and though he has adduced these to illustrate the way in which Eustathius distinguished the two natures in Christ, it is possible to see behind them an exposure of the doctrinal position of the Eusebians. In showing that they gave no place to the Lord's human soul, he struck at the heart of their Christological system.[3] Of his interpretation of the passage itself (*i.e.* Proverbs viii, 22) we know very little, although this must have been the central theme of the *Homily*.[4] Our information concerning the work may be limited, but we see in it the reply of

[1] This is the concluding part of a fragment from the *Homily on Proverbs viii*, 22. The first part was quoted above, p. 27. The translation of this section is taken from *N. and P.-N.F.* The original is to be found in Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 8; *P.G.* xviii, 676.

[2] Ἀρειομανῖται (*P.G.* xviii, 676 D); ἄνθρωποι ἄθεοι (*ibid.*); συκοφάνται (680 B).

[3] See fragment *P.G.* xviii, 680 A, where Eustathius quotes Philippians iii, 20, 21, with the following comment: εἰ δὲ τὸ ταπεινὸν μετασχηματίζων τῶν ἀνθρώπων σῶμα, σύμμορφον τῷ ἰδίῳ σώματι κατασκευάζει, ἕωλος πανταχόθεν ἀποδέδεικται ἡ τῶν ἐναντίων συκοφαντία. Their συκοφαντία would appear to be their denial of the place of the human soul in Christ. See also below, p. 51, n. 6.

[4] Three Syriac fragments and one Greek fragment, all of which we are inclined to accept as genuine, show us that he refers the quotation to the "Man of Christ". See below, p. 74 (for Syriac fragments) and p. 111 (for Greek fragment).

the Bishop of Antioch to the intrigue, as we have noticed from the fragment quoted above, and the general doctrinal outlook of the Eusebian party.

Meanwhile, he was face to face with a delicate situation at home: men of a younger generation, who, presumably, had been educated in the principles of the Lucianic school, were presenting themselves before him for ordination.[1] It was a situation which called for tactful handling, but Eustathius appears to have refused their request point-blank. When we take into consideration the character and later history of six of these would-be presbyters,[2] we feel that the action of the Antiochene Bishop was justifiable, but, looking at it from the point of view of the Eusebians, we not only appreciate their feelings, but we see in the occurrence a gathering of those forces which eventually effected his downfall. After all, these six men, from the Eusebian point of view, were some of the best products of their school of thought, and when they came to their own they did not fail to establish them as Bishops of important sees. Leontius and

[1] Athanasius, *Hist. Arian.* 4, has preserved this important detail, giving us the names of six of them. Philostorgius, *H.E.* ii, 14, says that Leontius and Eudoxius had been pupils of Lucian. We presume that the others at this time were men of kindred sentiment.

[2] Theodoret (*H.E.* ii, 10) may go too far when he likens Leontius to the sunken rocks of the sea, but there is no doubt that he belonged to the Lucianists' side, though he was no extremist. Perhaps he was rejected by Eustathius on account of his relations with the *subintroducta* Eustolium (Athanasius, *de Fuga*, 26; *Hist. Arian.* 28) as well as on account of his views. Eudoxius later became head of the extremists. His impieties, *e.g.* ὁ πατὴρ ἀσεβής, ὁ υἱὸς εὐσεβής (Socrates, *H.E.* ii, 43), may have been clever, but they were decidedly out of place. (Note how deploringly Hilary writes of them in his *contra Constantium*, 13; *P.L.* x, 592.) Stephanus was a real Eusebian. His shameful act when Bishop (Theodoret, *H.E.* ii, 9) sets him down as a person prepared to effect his purpose through miserable means. The views of George are quite clear. To his own satisfaction he could prove from scripture that once the Son was not (Athanasius, *de Synodis*, 17). Of Theodosius we know nothing. Eustathius, one of Arius' "most faithful disciples", had probably been expelled from Alexandria with him (Basil, *Ep.* 263). In later years he was celebrated for his inconsistency; he signed almost every creed of the Arian persuasion (Basil, *Ep.* 244). Certainly, Eustathius was justified in refusing to admit them εἰς κλῆρον, but it would seem that he was lacking in tact.

Stephanus afterwards became Bishops of Antioch; Theodosius was made Bishop of Tripolis. Eudoxius, largely through his own intrigue, became Bishop of New Rome, while Eustathius and George were made Bishops of Sebaste and Laodicea respectively. In the eyes of the party of Eusebius, the high-handed action of Eustathius must have appeared worse than that of Alexander when he expelled Arius. The latter had been banished at Nicaea because he had ventured a little too far, but nothing of this sort could be said at this time against those whom the Bishop refused to ordain. Moreover, they must have seen in his action a deliberate attack on their doctrinal principles, and this they were prepared to resist with all the forces, both good and bad, at their disposal. So the situation went from bad to worse, and bit by bit Eustathius was being hemmed in. The Eastern Bishops, already suspicious of his teaching, were now more confident of the assertions of the Eusebian party that Eustathius was a follower of the teaching of Sabellius. Their sympathies, therefore, went out to the rejected men. In this way circumstances were working towards a climax. What that climax was we must now attempt to reveal.

CHAPTER III

EUSTATHIUS' DOWNFALL

First of all let us gather together what evidence we possess concerning the end of Eustathius' rule at Antioch. We will notice first the testimony of Theodoret.[1] It appears from this that Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was held in great esteem by the Emperor after his return from exile,[2] was desirous of visiting the celebrated edifices which Constantine had erected in Jerusalem,[3] and, being furnished with royal carriages and a retinue, he set out thither with Bishop Theognius of Nicaea, "his accomplice in all his crimes". On their way they passed through Antioch where they were amicably received by its Bishop. Having visited the holy places, they interviewed Eusebius of Caesarea, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Aetius of Lydda, Theodotus of Laodicea, and others of kindred spirit, and made known to them the plot they had hatched against Eustathius. The cabal then proceeded to Antioch. There they suborned a low woman who sold them her tongue. A council was held, and the woman was brought in with a babe in her arms, impudently affirming that Eustathius was the father of the child. The Bishop, conscious of his innocence, asked her to bring forward witnesses to prove the truth of the accusation, but, although the woman declared she could not do so, the judges took her oath, and condemned him. The other Bishops advised him not to submit to such an unjust proceeding, but the originators of the plot promptly repaired to the Emperor, and secured his banishment "as an adulterer and a tyrant".[4]

[1] *H.E.* i, 21. He certainly makes a historical blunder at the outset when he says that Eusebius was Bishop of Constantinople. In 330 (the time of the deposition of Eustathius) he was still at Nicomedia. But this should not lead one to condemn the account at once. We believe that Theodoret here presents what was a popular tradition concerning Eustathius; no doubt it contains an element of truth.

[2] Eusebius, with Theognius, had returned from exile in 328 or 329.

[3] The Church of the Holy Sepulchre, dedicated in 335, was perhaps in process of erection at this time.

[4] ὡς μοιχὸν ὁμοῦ καὶ τύραννον.

Another piece of evidence is to be found in Socrates.[1] After describing the plots of Eusebius of Nicomedia against the youthful Athanasius, who but recently (328) had been made Bishop of Alexandria, he gives an account of the council which deposed Eustathius. It would seem that he is largely dependent upon the *Encomium of Eusebius of Emesa*, written by George of Laodicea, who, as we have seen, was one of those whom the Bishop of Antioch had refused to ordain. In this work, says Socrates, George relates that Eustathius was deposed on the charge of being a follower of Sabellius, and that the charge was made by Cyrus, who had succeeded him as Bishop of Beroea.[2] Socrates cannot see any truth in George's story, for he notices that George goes on to recount how Cyrus himself was condemned and deposed on a similar charge. Nor can he accept the statement of those who affirm that Eustathius was banished "on account of other causes which were not good",[3] for it is the custom of Bishops, he says, to attack the characters of those they depose. He is inclined to think, therefore, that Eustathius was deposed for other reasons,[4] and there leaves the matter.

Sozomen,[5] who has followed Socrates to some extent, says that a council was held at Antioch at which the Bishop was deprived because, "it is most generally believed",[6] he had accused Eusebius of Caesarea, Paulinus, and Patrophilus of favouring the heresy of Arius. The pretext resorted to for effecting his deposition was that he had defiled the priesthood by unholy deeds.

Altogether different is the evidence of Athanasius in his *History of the Arians*.[7] He does not mention the charges against his teaching and his morals, but says that "because he was very zealous for the truth and hated the Arian heresy, and would not receive those who adopted its tenets, he is falsely accused before the Emperor Constantine, and a charge invented against him that he had insulted his mother".[8]

[1] *H.E.* i, 24.

[2] φάσκων Εὐστάθιον ὑπὸ του Κύρου κατηγορεῖσθαι ὡς Σαβελλίζοντα.

[3] ὡς μὲν οὖν τινες φασίν, δι' ἄλλας οὐκ ἀγαθὰς αἰτίας· φανερῶς γὰρ οὐκ εἰρήκασι.

[4] δι' ἑτέρας προφάσεις.

[5] *H.E.* ii, 19.

[6] ὡς πολὺς ἔχει λόγος.

[7] Ch. 4.

[8] διαβάλλεται Κωνσταντίνῳ (some MSS. read Κωνσταντίῳ, but this is

Let us try and estimate the historical worth of all this evidence. It seems almost certain that the three historians, Theodoret, Socrates, and Sozomen, could not lay their hands on an exact account of the fall of Eustathius. When it is considered dispassionately, it will be felt, we think, that Theodoret's is the popular tradition concerning his end. We do not doubt that the main facts have some historical foundation, but at the same time we consider that, taken as a whole, his account is one-sided and decidedly pro-Eustathian. There are generally two sides to a question, but in this case only the one side has come down to us, and that in a popular form. Moreover, when we analyse the evidence of Socrates and Sozomen, we find that neither of them can make up their minds concerning the cause of Eustathius' deposition. Socrates would reject the charges of "Sabellianism" and immorality, and attribute the Bishop's fall to "other reasons". Sozomen bases his account on what is "generally believed" in his day. Hence it is apparent that if ever there was an official record of the Council it was lost at a very early date, the story of Eustathius' deposition being kept in memory through popular tradition. Athanasius, as we say, gives us a totally different account. It seems that he is relating another charge made against Eustathius, and that at Nicomedia. This fresh accusation, we must assume, was made after the Council had been held. When we recall that Theodoret brings forward at the end of his account somewhat similar evidence, although the charges are different, it will be felt that we are right in our assumption.

After this review of the evidence, it will be agreed, we think, that we do not possess a satisfactory account of that primary cause which led to the summoning of the Council and the eventual deposition of Eustathius. We believe that it needed something altogether more grievous than the Eusebian assertions that he was a follower of Sabellius and an immoral person, to move the hand of the Emperor to sign the decree of his banishment. Eusebian intrigue accounts for much, but we do not think it

clearly a textual error) *τῷ βασιλεῖ πρόφασις τε ἐπινοεῖται ὡς τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ ποιήσας ὕβριν.*

accounts for everything. It seems to us that the *Life of Constantine*, written by Eusebius of Caesarea, holds the key to the situation.

From Chapters 59 to 62 of this work we can obtain a glimpse of Antiochene affairs about this time. Of the four chapters, the last three consist of three letters which the Emperor wrote upon the establishment of peace after a period of turmoil. Chapter 59 is Eusebius' introduction to the letters, and is very important for our purpose. We will quote it almost in full. In this chapter Eusebius says that, at a time when the Church was flourishing everywhere,

> the spirit of envy...kindled a furious controversy at Antioch, and thereby involved the Church in that place in a series of tragic calamities, which had well-nigh occasioned the total overthrow of the city. The members of the Church were divided into two opposite parties; while the people, including even the magistrates and soldiery, were roused to such a pitch that the contest would have been decided by the sword, had not the watchful providence of God, as well as dread of the Emperor's displeasure, controlled the fury of the multitude....The Emperor gently pleaded, as it were by an embassy, with his people, sending among them one of the best approved and most faithful of those who were honoured with the dignity of Count; at the same time he exhorted them to a peaceable spirit by repeated letters....Having prevailed by these remonstrances, he excused their conduct in his subsequent letters, alleging that he himself had heard the merits of the case from him on whose account the disturbance had arisen. And these letters of his...I should have inserted in this present work, were it not that they might affix a mark of dishonour to the character of the persons accused. I will therefore omit these, being unwilling to revive the memory of past grievances, and will only annex those...which he wrote to testify his satisfaction at the re-establishment of peace and concord among the rest. In these letters he cautioned them against any desire to claim the ruler of another district, through whose intervention peace had been restored, as their own.

Then follow, each in a separate chapter, the three letters of Constantine, written in connection with the proposed election of Eusebius, to the Antiochenes, to Eusebius himself, and to the Council of Bishops which assembled to effect the election.

How, then, are we to interpret these chapters? Socrates[1] holds

[1] *H.E.* i, 24. Sozomen (*H.E.* ii, 19) takes a similar view.

that the disturbance arose after the Council of Deposition had been held, and that it marked the contest between the supporters of Eustathius and those of Eusebius of Caesarea, the former desiring the return of their leader, the latter urging for the election of their nominee. So he would infer that upon the intervention of the Emperor and the refusal of Eusebius to accept the Bishopric, the tumult was quelled, Euphronius being elected Bishop. Now in considering this interpretation, we must remember that Socrates seems to have had no other evidence beyond that contained in these chapters. In fact he almost acknowledges his lack of information at the end of his account.[1] So we are inclined to think that he read the chapters largely in the light of the history of the Eustathian schism. He knew that the followers of Eustathius had left the main body of the Church. Then was it not natural that they would be ready to resist the attempt to establish one who had been their leader's determined adversary? And was it not natural that they would seek to effect their leader's return? In this way Socrates could explain the cause of the tumult and do justice to the facts related by Eusebius. It is certainly a feasible interpretation. Nevertheless, we believe it is arrived at through what is but a *prima facie* review of the records.

Now according to Eusebius' account, as we have quoted it above, the following is the order of the events: first there comes the uproar; then the Emperor writes letters calling for peace, and sends the count to Antioch; peace ensues; then the Emperor writes "subsequent letters" in which he says he has heard "the merits of the case from him on whose account the disturbance has arisen"; the Emperor writes more letters, perhaps somewhat later, cautioning the people and the Bishops against the election of one "through whose intervention peace had been restored". Here, then, we have certain links in the chain of events. Let us try and fit them together. If we take Eusebius' order as our basis we can reasonably infer from two points of view that the uproar took place *before and not after* the holding of the Council, and that it was called to effect the peace. In the

[1] τοσαῦτα μὲν περὶ τῆς συνόδου, ἣ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν δι' Εὐστάθιον γέγονεν, ἱστορείσθω (*H.E.* i, 24).

first place, after peace had been restored, the Emperor writes to say that he has heard "the merits of the case from him on whose account the disturbance has arisen". It is but reasonable to see in this the somewhat parallel testimony of Athanasius and Theodoret, who say that Eustathius was accused before the Emperor. But this accusation, as Theodoret witnesses, was made at Nicomedia after the Council. In the second place, the Emperor in his later series of letters advises the Antiochenes and the assembled Bishops not to elect as Bishop of Antioch the one "through whose intervention peace had been restored". This of course refers to Eusebius himself, who refused to be translated from Caesarea, pleading the Nicene Canon[1] which forbade such translations. But we have good evidence for the fact that in all probability Eusebius himself presided at the Council, for in 343, at the Council of Sardica, Asclepas of Gaza *acta protulit quae confecta sunt apud Antiochiam praesentibus adversariis et Eusebio ex Caesarea*.[2] The argument is not altogether complete, for we are not certain that the Council which deposed Eustathius also deposed Asclepas. But, taken together, these two pieces of evidence throw light on the record of Eusebius in his *Life of Constantine*, and though we cannot adduce positive proof, we feel that they are enough to warrant the assumption that the uproar took place before the Council, and that at the Council itself an inquiry was made into its cause, the outcome being the restoration of peace.[3]

[1] Canon xv. [2] Hilary, *Frag.* ii; *P.L.* x, 636.

[3] Cavallera, *Le Schisme d'Antioch*, p. 70, has a different interpretation. He says that all the historians commencing with Socrates and Sozomen have erred in that they have thought the disturbance was connected with Eustathius. In his view, Ch. 59 deals with a disturbance which took place some two years after Eustathius had been deposed (thus allowing for the episcopates of Paulinus of Tyre and Eulalius), and that it was brought to a close by the proposed election of Eusebius. So he concludes that this was the first serious sedition, attributing its cause to the intrigue of several aspirants to the Antiochene see, and that the troubles incurred two years before in connection with the deposition of Eustathius, if there had been any trouble at all, were of much smaller moment. But we have tried to show above that Ch. 59, though its lack of definiteness is a sore hindrance, refers to a disturbance with which Eustathius had vital connection. Besides, while we acknowledge that the Antiochenes were of an excitable nature, we think it more probable that

Then what was the cause of the uproar? In all probability it was brought about through the attack of Eustathius on the Eusebian party. We have seen already that he was fully determined not only to maintain his own principles, but also to expose those of his adversaries. We can go further and say that the manner of his attack savoured of that of the despot, so that when they could bear his provocative rule no longer, those whom he assailed were ready to rise in open revolt. Antioch itself, the spiritual home of the Lucianists, must have bred many of kindred thought. So we surmise that the case of the would-be presbyters had roused the indignation of this section of the Antiochenes, and that in consequence they were already condemning the Bishop as a tyrant. It only needed on his part a continuance of the policy of "thorough" to turn their indignation into open hostility. So there came about the disturbance which "well-nigh occasioned the total overthrow of the city", for the Antiochenes were of an excitable nature. The Church itself was divided into two parties, the one pro-Eustathian, the other anti-Eustathian. Even the magistrates and the militia declared whether they were for or against their Bishop. Party-feeling rose to such a pitch that there was grave danger lest a bloody riot should ensue. Report of these things came to the Emperor's ears at Nicomedia, where Eusebius its Bishop, who had returned from exile in 328 or 329, was strongly entrenched in the imperial favour.[1] No doubt he would make it clear to Constantine that Eustathius was to blame for the whole occurrence, and that the Antiochenes were really in revolt against the high-handed rule of a turbulent Bishop. So the Emperor despatched letters urging them to be at peace, and, to see that his wishes were carried out, he sent to Antioch one of his counts, who was probably Strategius Musonianus by name. Perhaps the Council (held in 330 or 331[2]) was summoned by the count, that an inquiry might be made into the

a matter of much deeper moment than "the intrigue of several competitors" was responsible for the display of such a violent party spirit.

[1] Socrates, *H.E.* i, 23.

[2] This date allows time for Eusebius of Nicomedia, who returned from exile in 328 or 329, to gain the Emperor's favour. It also agrees with

whole case, although it is almost certain that it had behind it the wire-pulling of the Eusebian party.

Eustathius was doomed from the start. He had been at loggerheads with Eusebius of Caesarea—seemingly the president of the Council[1]—since the days of Nicaea. He had maintained a vigorous attack on the party of Eusebius of Nicomedia in his "fiery zeal for true religion",[2] and now that that party with its crafty leader had secured the Emperor's favour, Eustathius could expect no mercy. Moreover, his autocratic rule would cause the Eastern Bishops—many of whom were present at the Council[3]—to suspect him of being one who supported the dreaded teaching of Sabellius, and it is altogether likely that the count Musonianus would be predisposed to be rid of him as a disturber of the peace which the Emperor desired. Once again, therefore, did Eusebius of Nicomedia rally his supporters round him that full advantage might be taken of such a favourable opportunity. The Bishop of Nicomedia, with Patrophilus, Paulinus, Theodotus, Aetius and the rest of their following were ready with their accusations[4]. To accuse Eustathius of being a Sabellian, whether true or not, would win over the majority of the assembled Bishops; to accuse him of being a tyrant, to say the very least of it, would appeal to Musonianus, who at imperial command had come to re-establish the peace; to accuse him of being an adulterer would add flavour to the proceedings, and help to make their victory more certain.

Was there any truth in these three charges? We will first consider the charge against the Bishop's morals. In all fairness to Eustathius we would denounce it as a trumped up case. Theodoret, who tells us the story in detail, says in a later chapter[5] that the woman who made the accusation before the Council,

Theodoret, *H.E.* iii, 5, where he says that the Eustathian Schism lasted for 85 years, terminating with the episcopate of Alexander (412–415).

[1] See above, p. 44. [2] Theodoret, *Ep.* 151.

[3] *παρῆσαν γὰρ οὐκ ὀλίγοι*, says Theodoret (*H.E.* i, 21) when speaking of the Bishops present at the Council. Philostorgius (*H.E.* ii, 7) says 250 were present, though we cannot vouch for his accuracy.

[4] Thus far, making use of Theodoret's account (*H.E.* i, 21). It is quite likely, of course, that the Eusebians made all preparation for the Council, and that this was done at the time of a visit to the Holy Places.

[5] *H.E.* i, 22.

afterwards, on a sick-bed, confessed that she had been bribed to give false witness, although, she said, her oath was not altogether false, inasmuch as a certain Eustathius was indeed the father of her child, but he was a copper-smith! Moreover, one has only to read the accusations brought against Athanasius or the letter of the Council of Philippopolis in 343 to be assured that it was not thought out of place to improve the situation by bringing forward testimony of this unseemly kind. It is significant that Jerome, writing of these "machinations", adduces the case of Eustathius by way of illustration.[1] So we attribute this charge to the vile intrigue of the Eusebian party.[2]

But in regard to the other two charges, it seems true that the opponents of Eustathius could say something against him. At this point we cannot enter fully into the doctrinal charge, which we shall consider in a later chapter. Here we would say that, in our opinion, despite the evidence of Socrates, who is not prepared to admit its truth, Eustathius' teaching with its insistence on the unity of the Divinity cannot be explained satisfactorily unless we are prepared to see in it a doctrinal basis akin to that of Sabellianism. Moreover, we believe that there was some truth in the charge of tyranny. While acknowledging to the fullest extent that Eustathius in his own generation was nearer the truth than the Eusebians, and that he was justified in making an attack upon them, we must be prepared to see behind that attack a man of provocative temper. So we attribute the Antiochene tumult partly to his own determined rule, and partly to the retaliatory measures of his opponents. When the count Musonianus inquired into Antiochene affairs he could not but regard his

[1] *Apol. adv. Ruf.* iii. 42: *Istae machinae haereticorum...ut convicti de perfidia ad maledicta se conferant. Sic Eustathius Antiochenus episcopus filios dum nescit invenit.*

[2] We fail to see a reference to this charge in Constantine's letter to the Antiochenes (*Life of Const.* iii, 60). The τὸν ῥύπον ἐκεῖνον seems to refer to the disturbance which was then at an end, ὁμόνοια, to which it stands opposed, being established in its place. We may also quote here the judgment of the Council of Philippopolis—we have seen how much it is worth—*de quorum* (*i.e.* Eustathius and Kymatius of Paltus) *vitae infamia turpi dicendum nihil est: exitus enim illorum eos omnibus declaravit* (*P.L.* x, 674).

oppressive rule as the cause of the uproar, the seeming loyalty of the Eusebians concealing their part in creating the disturbance. As a tyrant, then, he was condemned by the secular arm. And what could Musonianus do but order his arrest and have him conveyed to Nicomedia, there to plead his case before the Emperor?

Eusebius of Nicomedia—we presume that the case was important enough for him to see it through in person—and one or two of his supporters, therefore, hurried away to the Court to tell the Emperor of all that had taken place, and to be ready against the arrival of Eustathius. He came, and a number of priests and deacons accompanied him. When the case was heard before Constantine, the Eusebians were ready with a charge in keeping with their imperial surroundings. They told how he had been deposed as an adulterer and a tyrant;[1] now they went further and related to the Emperor how he had cast a slur upon the character of his mother, Helena.[2] To bring forward such a charge of high-treason was a clever move, and altogether consistent with the subtle dealing of the Eusebian party. The result was that Eustathius was banished at the Emperor's command, and the company of clergy proceeded with him on his way to distant Thrace.[3] The Eusebians had won the day; the ignominy they had suffered through Eustathius, both at Nicaea and during the years that followed, had been avenged, for now their chief opponent had met his doom.[4]

[1] So Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 21.

[2] Using the evidence of Athanasius (above, p. 40). Ambrose says: *Stabulariam hanc primo fuisse asserunt* (quoted *D.C.B.* ii, 383). So perhaps Eustathius in his impetuosity had repeated the popular story concerning Helena's past. It is quite possible that his remark had been directed against the Lucianists and their supporters, for Helena held Lucian in honoured memory. See Philostorgius, *H.E.* ii, 12.

[3] Athanasius, *Hist. Arian.* 4. But on place of banishment see below, pp. 50, 51. It is noteworthy that Sozomen (*H.E.* ii, 19) says that Eustathius bore the injustice calmly.

[4] The downfall of Eustathius marked the beginning of the Eusebian offensive against his Syrian supporters. (We do not imagine that he stood alone.) Athanasius (*Hist. Arian.* 5; *de Fuga*, 3) gives us a list of those who were deprived at this time. Perhaps Kymatius of Paltus (joined with Eustathius in the *exitus*, see above, p. 47, n. 2) and Cyrus

It would seem that the Eusebian party hesitated before filling the vacant see of Antioch. We are inclined to adopt the suggestion of Duchesne and see in Paulinus of Tyre, not the consecrated Bishop of Antioch, but a "provisional administrator", set up to hold a watching brief on behalf of the party.[1] Eustathius had his supporters, and they had no wish to incur the wrath of the Emperor through causing another riot. Paulinus only lived six months, and he was succeeded by Eulalius,[2] who, perhaps, served in the same capacity. If we may trust the records, the latter, however, only lived three months after he came to Antioch. After this interval the Eusebians determined to elect Eustathius' successor[3]. For this purpose a council of Eusebian Bishops met at Antioch, and, supported by the anti-Eustathian party in the city, sought to effect the translation of Eustathius' greatest foe, Eusebius of Caesarea. Eusebius, however, in his worldly wisdom preferred to uphold the Nicene Canon rather than face the

of Beroea (Socrates, *H.E.* i, 24) met their doom at the Council which deposed Eustathius. We have seen above (p. 44) that there are good grounds for assuming that Asclepas of Gaza was deposed at the same time. Perhaps we may also place here the deposition of Hellenicus of Tripolis and Euphration of Balaneae (*Hist. Arian.* 5). It is clear that the Eusebians, who had now come to their own, were making every effort to oust their opponents. Of the old Nicene vanguard, Alexander had died in 328, Hosius was in distant Spain, and Eustathius was now banished. Macarius of Jerusalem still continued, though he had his difficulties (Sozomen, *H.E.* ii, 20). Marcellus now led the attack in the Nicene cause, and his removal came in 336.

[1] Philostorgius (*H.E.* iii, 15) and Eusebius (*c. Marcellum*, i, 4; Klostermann, *l.c.* p. 18) both say that Paulinus was transferred to Antioch. Other historians do not mention him. But the tradition seems genuine, although the Antiochene succession, both before and after the episcopate of Eustathius, is very difficult to follow. Duchesne (*History of the Early Christian Church*, Eng. tr. ii, 130) suggests that Paulinus was provisional administrator because it seems that at this time he was without a see. Perhaps the tradition (Socrates, *H.E.* i, 24) that the see of Antioch was vacant "successively for eight years" has some historical foundation. Although the interregnum may not have lasted so long (Flacillus seems to have been Bishop of Antioch when he presided at the Council of Tyre in 335), the tradition may give some support to the suggestion that both Paulinus and Eulalius were provisional administrators.

[2] So Theodoret (*H.E.* i, 22), Jerome (*Chron.*; *P.L.* xxvii, 677) and Philostorgius (*H.E.* iii, 15).

[3] *Life of Constantine*, iii, 60–62.

supporters of him whose deposition he had been one to secure. A certain Euphronius[1] was elected in his stead, but he only lived a year and a few months. In Flacillus, who succeeded him, the Eusebians and Eusebius of Caesarea had a man after their own heart.[2] Eusebius of Nicomedia and his fellows had fought and prevailed at Antioch, but the price they had to pay for their victory was the Eustathian schism which was to be a running-sore in the life of the Church of Antioch for the next eighty-five years.[3]

But let us return to the history of Eustathius. It is difficult to give a definite answer to the question of the place of his banishment. Socrates, Sozomen, and Athanasius are silent on the point. Jerome[4] tells us that it was Trajanopolis in Thrace, adding significantly, "where he is until this day". Chrysostom[5] in his

[1] Perhaps this is the Euphronius mentioned in Eusebius' *c. Marcellum*, i, 4 (Klostermann, *l.c.* p. 26). If this is the case, he was of the same school of thought as Narcissus and Eusebius of Nicomedia.

[2] Although we know very little of him, it seems clear that his sympathies were with the Eusebian party. He presided at the Councils of Tyre (335) and Antioch (341). He must have been a man of scholarship, for Eusebius dedicated to him his *de Ecclesiastica Theologia*, requesting him to make any alterations he thought fit (Klostermann, *l.c.* p. 60). Theodoret goes too far when he says (*H.E.* ii, 24) that it would need a special volume to recount his evil deeds along with those of Stephanus and Leontius.

[3] A few details concerning the Eustathians, who thus separated themselves from the main body of the Antiochene Church, may not be out of place. The party was regarded as the orthodox church of Antioch by Rome and Athanasius. Their leader was Paulinus, a presbyter. In the spring of 346 Athanasius, when passing through Antioch, held communion with them, and not with the main body under Bishop Leontius. At this time he was asked to allow the Arians to have a church of their own at Alexandria. He made a similar request for the Eustathians at Antioch. The assembled Bishops thought it best not to press their demand (Socrates, *H.E.* ii, 23). In 362 an attempt was made to restore them to the main body under Bishop Meletius, but the attempt failed through the meddlesomeness of Lucifer of Calaris, who consecrated Paulinus as their Bishop. The schism continued until the fifth century, when Alexander (412–415) brought them into the fold. It would seem that even then the sore was not completely healed, for the few remaining Eustathians did not return till the relics of Eustathius were brought to Antioch under Calandio (482–485).

[4] *De Vir. Illustr.* 85: *ubi usque hodie conditus est.*

[5] The Homily is of very little use for this study. It is to be found in *P.G.* I. 597–606.

homily on Eustathius maintains that he was banished into Thrace, and with his affirmations Philostorgius[1] may be said to agree. Theodoret says he was conducted across Thrace to a city of Illyricum.[2] We have also the evidence of the Chroniclers,[3] who say that he was buried at Philippi of Macedonia, and that from this place his relics were removed to Antioch during the episcopate of Calandio towards the end of the fifth century. Tillemont suggests that he spent part of his exile at Trajanopolis, and that the last place of his exile was Philippi, where he died. But this is in conflict with Jerome's statement. Perhaps we had better abandon all idea of reaching a satisfactory conclusion, and merely say that in all probability he was exiled into Thrace.

But, though in exile, Eustathius was not the man to remain silent. In his righteous indignation he took up his pen once more, and sought to expose the fundamental errors of the doctrinal position of his old opponents. We would place here at least two of his works, his *de Anima et contra Arianos*, and his *contra Arianos*, the latter, it would seem, consisting of some eight books.[4] Now without infringing on what will be said in later chapters, we would here notice the main points of his attack so far as we can ascertain them from the surviving fragments. As in the *Homily on Proverbs viii*, 22, written before his deposition, so here, he indulges in a tirade against the Eusebians. They are "demented chorus-dancers on the Arian stage"; they are "horrible sycophants and accusers";[5] they "concoct their earth-born deceits".[6] In the former work, the *de Anima et contra Arianos*, he attacks the centre of their Christological position. As we shall

[1] *H.E.* ii, 7: εἰς τὴν Ἑσπέραν μεθόριον ποιησάμενος.

[2] *H.E.* i. 20: καὶ ἐκεῖνος μὲν διὰ τῆς Θράκης εἰς Ἰλλυρικὴν πόλιν ἀπήχθη.

[3] For the texts of Theodorus Lector (*P.G.* lxxxvi, 183), Theophanes and Victor, see Cavallera, *Le Schisme*, p. 297, n. 2.

[4] *P.G.* xviii, 693 (1st frag. on page).

[5] *L.c.* 692 B. See below, p. 53, n. 1.

[6] *L.c.* 689 B: διὰ τί περὶ πολλοῦ ποιοῦνται δεικνύναι τὸν Χριστὸν ἄψυχον ἀνειληφέναι σῶμα, γεώδεις πλάττοντες ἀπάτας; ἵνα, εἰ δυνηθεῖεν ὑποφθεῖραί τινάς, ταῦθ' οὕτως ἔχειν ὁρίζεσθαι, τηνικαῦτα τὰς τῶν παθῶν ἀλλοιώσεις τῷ θείῳ περιάψαντες πνεύματι, ῥαδίως ἀναπείσωσιν αὐτούς, ὡς οὐκ ἔστι τὸ τρεπτὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀτρέπτου φύσεως γεννηθέν. The fragment clearly reveals the greatness of Eustathius' mind.

see later on, he is tireless in insisting on the place of the human soul in Christ, for it forms one of the foundation principles of his teaching. When, therefore, he sees his opponents denying its place, he at once attacks them from his point of view, and thereby strikes at their whole position. It is greatly to the credit of Eustathius that he clearly analyses the tenets of the Eusebians, and marks that through the denial of the human soul they could attribute change to the Logos who had taken its place, and so make out their case that, since the Logos was capable of change, He was not begotten of the unchangeable nature.[1] Moreover, he sees in their position a confusion of the two natures in Christ, and he makes it quite evident that, in asserting that the Logos took the place of the human soul, they would attribute suffering to the divine. Such a position he will not tolerate. Perhaps, at this point, we can best illustrate his thought—and, at the same time, his character—by quoting a passage from one of the fragments of the second work, his *contra Arianos*: *Ergo vesaniunt et bacchantur et furiunt, et insaniunt et suis mentibus excesserunt, qui Deo Verbo passionem applicare praesumunt.*[2] It would seem, also, that in this second work the exiled Bishop reviews the Arian teaching concerning the Son's relation to God. For them to beget is the same as to create, but Eustathius points out very clearly that the two are essentially different, and that they cannot be posited in relation to one and the same nature.[3] Moreover, with clear insight he attacks that position which would attribute a beginning of existence to the Son.[4] Another interesting relic

[1] See previous note.

[2] *P.G.* xviii, 693 (last frag. on page).

[3] According to Arian teaching: *ταὐτὸν γὰρ τὸ γέννημα καὶ ποίημά ἐστι* (Athanasius, *Orat.* ii, 58). Eustathius replies (*l.c.* 692): *εἰ γὰρ κτιστὸς οὐκ ἄρα γεννητός. εἰ δὲ γεννητός, οὐ κτιστός, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ οἷόν τε περὶ τὴν αὐτὴν φύσιν ἑκάτερον στρέφεσθαι τὸ γένος. σημεῖόν τε ὅτι ἀδύνατον εἰπεῖν περὶ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν φύσιν τὸ κτιστὸν ὑπάρχειν καὶ τὸ ἄκτιστον. καθολικὸς γὰρ ὁ λόγος τῷ διδασκάλῳ.* The above is the text as emended by Cavallera. (Frag. 63 in his collection.)

[4] According to Arian teaching: *ἀλλ' ἀρχὴν τοῦ κτίζεσθαι ἔσχε καὶ αὐτός* (Athanasius, *Orat.* i, 5). Similar teaching is to be found in the letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia to Arius (*de Synodis*, 17). Eustathius replies (*l.c.* 696 A): *πᾶν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχον καὶ τέλος ἐπιδέχεται. τὸ δὲ τέλος ἐπιδεχόμενον φθορᾶς ἐστι δεκτικόν.*

of the work is a fragment[1] wherein he exposes the way in which his opponents interpret the scriptures. Instead of severing passages from their context to secure a meaning in harmony with their own thought, he says that they should contend after a truth-loving fashion, and embrace under their survey every passage without distinction. It is lamentable that so little of this great work has come down to us. Yet one thing is quite evident: loyal to his cause, Eustathius, though in exile, continued his attack against his opponents. We believe he did so till he died.

We must now discuss the highly controversial point of the date of the death of Eustathius. Generally speaking, scholars have adopted one of two views. On the one hand, Gwatkin[2] would place his death from 356 to 360. Raven[3] also would favour this view, and at the same time would recognise the possibility that he survived till 370. On the other hand, it is more generally held that he died before Constantine re-called the exiled Bishops in 337. Du Pin[4] and Tillemont[5] in a former generation, and Loofs,[6] Cavallera[7] and Bardenhewer[8] in more recent times have all advocated this view. We believe it is nearer the truth. Let us look at the evidence.

Socrates and Sozomen[9] would have us infer that Eustathius was alive in 370. They say that when Eudoxius of Constantinople

[1] *L.c.* 692 B: ἀλλ' οἱ παράδοξοι τῆς Ἀρείου θυμέλης μεσόχοροι τὸ μὲν ἁμαρτίαν πεποιηκέναι τὸν χριστὸν φράζουσι...τὸ δέ, ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ (2 Cor. v, 19), οὔτε ἐν μνήμῃ φέρουσιν, οὔτε τοῖς τῆς γλώττης ὀργάνοις ἐκφωνοῦσιν· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ δεινοὶ συκοφάνται καὶ κατήγοροι ἀκρωτηριάσαντες τὸ χωρίον, τὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς κατηγορίας ποιοῦνται. εἶτα καὶ ἡ ψῆφος ἡ ὑπὲρ τοῦ νόμου· δεῖ δὲ φιλαλήθως τοὺς ἐννόμως ἀγωνιστὰς (2 Tim. ii, 5), πάντα συμπεριλαβόντας ἀπαραλείπτως, ἀλλὰ μὴ πρὸς ἀπάτην, μέρος μὲν ἀποσιωπᾷν, μέρος δὲ ἀποσπῶντας προφέρειν. It is noteworthy that the same complaint is made by Alexander of Alexandria (Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 4) and Athanasius (*Orat.* i, 37 and 52).

[2] *Studies of Arianism*, p. 74 n.

[3] *Apollinarianism*, p. 118.

[4] Art. on Eustathius in his *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques*, ii.

[5] *Mémoires*, vii, 21–31.

[6] Art. "Eustathius of Antioch" in Herzog-Hauck, v, p. 626.

[7] *Le Schisme d'Antioche*, p. 65.

[8] *Gesch. der altkirchlichen Literatur*, iii, p. 231.

[9] Socrates, *H.E.* iv, 14; Sozomen, *H.E.* vi, 13.

died, the orthodox party set up Evagrius[1] as Bishop against Demophilus, the Arian nominee. This Evagrius, they say, was ordained by Eustathius who had been recalled from exile by the Emperor Jovian, and had come to Constantinople to confirm the faithful. Most scholars are inclined to reject this evidence, for they agree that it is hardly likely that the Eustathian party at Antioch would have made Paulinus their Bishop in 362[2] if Eustathius had been alive at that time. The supporters of the first view accept rather the evidence of Theodoret,[3] who says that Eustathius died before the election of Meletius. Meletius was made Bishop of Antioch in 361, and, since Paulinus was made Bishop of the Eustathian party in 362, it has been urged that the latter, perhaps after a few years' delay, took the place of Eustathius as the episcopal head of the party, for, says Gwatkin,[4] "it is not likely that his adherents at Antioch would remain headless for twenty years". Gwatkin supports his conclusion by adducing further considerations. Thus he points out that Athanasius, writing in 356,[5] gives a list of the Bishops who were exiled about 330, and mentions the death of Eutropius, whose name is included in the list, but makes no reference to the death of Eustathius. Again, he points out that "we have some fragments from a work of his against Photinus, who did not come into prominence till near 343". These seem to be the main arguments for the later date. What is to be said for the other view?

It is strange that we hear no more concerning Eustathius after 330. He played his part valiantly during the short time he was Bishop of Antioch, but after his deposition never again does he appear on the ecclesiastical stage. He does not return with the exiled Bishops in 337; nor does he return when they were recalled by the Emperor Julian in 360. His name is not mentioned in the letter of the Council of Sardica in 343, and this was the Council which, as we shall soon see, maintained his principles and

[1] Is it possible that this Evagrius has been confused with the Evagrius who was made *Bishop of the Eustathian party* at Antioch, *c.* 388?

[2] See above, p. 50, n. 3.

[3] *H.E.* iii, 4. He merely says: *πρὸ γὰρ τῆς Μελετίου χειροτονίας Εὐσταθίου τετελευτηκότος....*

[4] *Studies of Arianism*, p. 74 n.

[5] *De Fuga*, 3.

virtually avenged his downfall. Had he been alive, we feel, his case would have been examined, and, like the rest of the Bishops who had opposed the Eusebian party, he would have been found blameless. Moreover, when we come to examine his doctrinal teaching, we find that his standpoint is ante-Nicene rather than post-Nicene. His writings reveal an author who stands at the gate of a new era in dogmatic theology; he remains outside, while a fresh generation enters in with the fruits of his labours. It may be felt that a book like the *de Anima et contra Arianos* is more in keeping with the Christological aspect which the Arian controversy took about the middle of the century. We believe it would be a false deduction. Everything in it answers to the doctrinal situation in the opening stages of the controversy, and, as we shall see, he attacks his foes from an ante-Nicene point of view. Perhaps he was already in the middle years of life when he came to Antioch. He was a Confessor, as Athanasius and Theodoret maintain,[1] and some years before 325, it seems, he had already gained a reputation as an exegete.[2]

The argument for the view that he died before 337 may be strengthened by an inquiry into the considerations brought forward in support of the other view. It is agreed that the evidence of Socrates and Sozomen carries no weight, but we are still face to face with that of Theodoret who says that he died before the election of Meletius. How are we to overcome the difficulty? Once more we would say that even the early historians found it difficult to secure exact details of the life of Eustathius. Chrysostom composed a homily upon him, but for the most part he eulogised the Eustathius of his own imagination rather than the Eustathius of history. So we are inclined to put little faith in Theodoret's account. It seems almost obvious from its lack of definiteness that he did not know when Eustathius died, and perhaps he liked to think that "the divine Meletius", as he calls him, was his spiritual successor.[3] Neither do we think that our

[1] See above, p. 34.

[2] So Eutropius (it is true he is but a name), not being satisfied with Origen's interpretation of the story of the Witch of Endor (1 Sam. xxviii) writes to him to secure his opinion thereon. See below, p. 75.

[3] In his *H.E.* he always alludes to Meletius in terms of praise, most often calling him ὁ θεῖος Μελέτιος or ὁ μέγας Μελέτιος. He associates

main contention will suffer any loss if we are compelled to admit that the Eustathian party was "headless for twenty years" and more. We have already seen that after the downfall of Eustathius the Eusebians were in the ascendant, and so they remained. Under such circumstances it was well-nigh impossible for the Eustathians to attempt to set up an opposing Bishop. Rather did they continue under the rule of the presbyter Paulinus until the meddlesome Lucifer arrived in 362, and prevented the possible reunion through making him Bishop.[1] The fact that Athanasius does not say that Eustathius was dead when he writes in 356 is hardly a strong argument, for, in a similar passage in his *History of the Arians*, written about the same time, he says: "There *was* one Eustathius, a Confessor...."[2] Neither is the consideration that he wrote a work against Photinus of great weight; we shall see in the next chapter that it is to be placed among the spurious works attributed to him. It seems, then, that it is nearer the truth to say that in all probability he died before 337, or at any rate before 343.[3]

The history of Eustathius virtually ends with the Council of Sardica (343) when his cause was vindicated, and his deposition avenged. In 337 Constantine died, and the Eusebians maintained their power, being supported by his son Constantius, the new Eastern Emperor. So they continued their attack on the supporters of the Nicene Definition. Athanasius, Asclepas, and

Eustathius with him and Flavian as "luminaries of the East" in *Ep.* 145, and in *Ep.* 151 the two are again placed side by side, Theodoret claiming that in his Christological assertions he is but following their teaching.

[1] See above, p. 50, n. 3.

[2] *Hist. Arian.* 4: Εὐστάθιός τις ἦν ὁμολογήτης. It would seem that at this time he was little more than a name. Compare Cavallera (*l.c.*): *S. Athanase emploie une formule qui montre qu'au temps où il écrivait* (358), *Eustathe était mort depuis longtemps et oublié.*

[3] No mention has been made in the above argument of the "*exitus*" of Eustathius, referred to in the passage from the Synodical Letter of the Council of Philippopolis (quoted above, p. 47, n. 2). In all probability the Kymatius with whom he is there associated was Bishop of Paltus (Athanasius mentions his deposition *c.* 330 in his *Hist. Arian.* 5 and his *de Fuga*, 5), and he was alive in 362 (see *Tomus ad Antioch*). The "exitus", therefore, would seem to refer to his deposition and not to his death.

Marcellus were disposed of almost as soon as they had returned from exile in 337. Banished from their sees, they found their way to Rome, where Pope Julius was ready to take up their cause. Constans, now Emperor of the West, was approached, and he demanded that a council of Eastern and Western Bishops should be held to arrive at a settlement of the unhappy state of things in the East. Constantius, engaged in the Persian War, did not dare to refuse. So to Sardica, a town just within the western division of the Empire, came the Western Bishops "with Hosius of Cordova for their father". The Eastern Bishops brought with them the count Musonianus who had served them well at the deposition of Eustathius. To their dismay they found that he was not allowed to take part in the proceedings. It was clear from the start that the Westerns had the upper hand; the Eastern Bishops found they were present on their trial.[1] The old Nicene vanguard had at last come to its own. Realising the power of the West, the Bishops of the East thought fit to decamp in the night. They had heard, forsooth, of Constantius' victory on the Persian frontier. Nevertheless, they tarried at the neighbouring Philippopolis, and sounded their trumpet against the monstrosities of their western brethren.

Meanwhile at Sardica the Bishops examined the charges brought by the Eusebians against "the beloved brethren and fellow-ministers", Athanasius, Asclepas, and Marcellus. They were acquitted. The works of Marcellus were read before the Council, and it was found that the Eusebians had interpreted them falsely.[2] Doctrinally, the Bishops at Sardica insisted upon the divine unity. They were in agreement with the sentiments expressed in a Statement there brought forward, although, in

[1] Compare the complaint of the Easterns: *novam legem introducere putaverunt ut Orientales episcopi ab Occidentalibus judicarentur* (Letter of Council of Philippopolis, *P.L.* x, 666).

[2] The Easterns naturally expressed their amazement: *vehementer autem admirati sumus, quatenus eum, qui aliter quam in vero est audet Evangelium praedicare, quidam, qui se ecclesiasticos esse volunt, facile ad communionem recipiunt; nec blasphemias ejus, quae in ipsius libro signatae sunt, inquirentes* (*P.L.* x, 662). The approval of Marcellus was their false move; Mount Soucis became the Mount of Separation between East and West (Socrates, *H.E.* ii, 22).

their wisdom, they did not issue it as a new creed.[1] What we should notice here is that the beliefs expressed in the Statement are altogether consistent with those of Eustathius. In its doctrine of God it confesses the *μία θεότης*,[2] and in its Christology it distinguishes the natures and upholds the truth that suffering must not be attributed to the divine.[3] In fact, it is so consistent

[1] Found in Theodoret, *H.E.* ii, 8; Hahn[3], 188. Compare also Athanasius, *Tomus ad Antioch.*

[2] The Statement is very interesting in that it coincides with the doctrinal position of Eustathius. In their insistence on the unity of the Godhead, those responsible for the Statement seem to lose sight of the truth of the Son's personal existence. Thus they firmly maintain the *μία ὑπόστασις* of the Father and the Son, and confess the *μία πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ θεότης*. They hold that the words "I and the Father are one" were spoken *διὰ τὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως ἑνότητα ἤτις ἐστὶ μία τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ*. (This against the Lucianists' teaching which would attribute this unity to the *συμφωνία* and *ὁμόνοια* between the Father and the Son.) The Father, they say, was never without the Son, nor the Son without the Father. They do not deny the fact of the begetting, but they say that the Son was begotten before all things, the Creator and Artificer of angels, of the world, and of the human race. They confess that the Logos, who being always has no beginning, is the Son, true God, and Wisdom, and Power. But the truth of the Son's personal being is not properly postulated. They may say that the Father is not the Son, and that the Son is not the Father, but the distinction they make is purely nominal; *οὐδέ τις ἀρνεῖταί ποτε τὸν πατέρα τοῦ υἱοῦ μείζονα οὐ δι' ἄλλην ὑπόστασιν οὐ δι' ἄλλην διαφοράν, ἀλλ' ὅτι αὐτὸ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς μεῖζόν ἐστι τοῦ υἱοῦ*. One may reasonably conclude that for those who drew up the Statement the Son is nothing more than an attribute (the *λόγος*, *σοφία*, and *δύναμις*) of the one Divinity. (Compare: *ὁμολογοῦμεν δύναμιν εἶναι τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν υἱόν*.) There is no mention of the eternal generation of the Son as Son, as there is no mention of his individual existence. It is not to be wondered at that Athanasius in 362 urged the Eustathian party to prohibit its reading and publication (*Tomus ad Antioch*). Compare with all this what is said in Ch. v on Eustathius' teaching concerning God, esp. pp. 88–93.

[3] Compare: *καὶ τοῦτο* (*i.e. τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα*) *οὐ πέπονθεν, ἀλλ' ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὃν ἐνεδύσατο, ὃν ἀνέλαβεν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν παθεῖν δυνάμενον. ὅτι ἄνθρωπος θνητός, θεὸς δὲ ἀθάνατος. πιστεύομεν ὅτι τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀνέστη οὐχ ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀλλ' ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἀνέστη, ὅντινα καὶ προσηνέγκε τῷ πατρὶ ἑαυτοῦ δῶρον, ὃν ἐλευθέρωσεν ἐκ τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τῆς φθορᾶς*. It is very significant that Eustathius often speaks of "the divine spirit" (below, p. 101) as the divine in Christ, and of *ὁ ἄνθρωπος* (below, p. 101) as the manhood, that he, too, refers to the manhood as being "clothed" (p. 100) or being "assumed" (using *ἀναλαμβάνειν*, *P.G.* xviii, 680 c), and that he too most emphatically

with the doctrinal thought of Eustathius that we venture to make the suggestion that it proceeded from one of the Eustathian party. But not only did Sardica vindicate the cause for which Eustathius stood; we find, too, that the Council virtually avenged his deposition. It is a striking fact that most of his opponents who were alive in 343 now met their doom. Patrophilus, Narcissus, Theodorus, Stephanus and George of Laodicea were among those whom Sardica deposed.[1] If Eusebius of Nicomedia, and perhaps his namesake of Caesarea, had been alive at this time, it is more than likely that their names would have been found in the list of the condemned. Eustathius, we believe, would have rejoiced had he seen the day of Sardica.

makes the same distinction between the two natures (below, pp. 112–114).

[1] Patrophilus of Scythopolis had been one of the Eusebian cabal which sought to depose Eustathius (Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 21). Though he is not mentioned in the lists given by Theodoret (*H.E.* ii, 8) and Athanasius (*Apol. c. Arian.* 44) it seems from the latter's *ad Episcopos Aegypti*, 7, that he was deposed at Sardica. Narcissus had been one of the chief supporters of Eusebius of Nicomedia (see above, pp. 14, 18). Theodorus of Heraclea had been associated with the Bishops who assembled at Antioch to effect the translation of Eusebius of Caesarea (*Life of Const.* iii, 62). Stephanus and George had been two of those whom Eustathius refused to admit εἰς κλῆρον (see above, p. 38). Theodotus of Laodicea and Aetius of Lydda, members of the cabal mentioned above, were probably dead at this time.

CHAPTER IV

EUSTATHIUS' WORKS AND EXEGESIS

It is lamentable that only one of the genuine literary productions of Eustathius has come down to us in its entirety. This is his *de Engastrimytho contra Origenem*, which is important for a study of his exegesis. We can only judge the worth of his doctrinal works from existing fragments, some fifty of which were collected in 1857 by Migne in Vol. XVIII of his *Greek Patrology*. Later (1883–4) Pitra and Martin published three more Greek and ten more Syriac fragments in *Analecta Sacra*. In 1905, Cavallera, having discovered a homily attributed to Eustathius, published it, together with some thirty additional fragments, in his *In Lazarum, Mariam et Martham Homilia Christologica*. In addition we have the *Allocutio ad Constantinum*, which he is supposed to have delivered at Nicaea, and the *Commentarius in Hexaemeron*.

Now we shall find that there is much in this *débris* which is spurious. We are doubtful, too, of the genuineness of several of the fragments. But having little or no knowledge of patristic writings it is quite impossible for us to undertake anything like a critical review of these remains; all we intend to do in this chapter is to divide them into the three categories of spurious, doubtful, and genuine. In doing so, our judgment will be based almost always on the internal evidence of the work or fragment under discussion. We shall take as our criterion what we know to be the genuine works of Eustathius, and in their light we shall make our decision.

We will deal first with the works which are acknowledged by scholars to be spurious, and in this category we place at once the *Allocutio* and the work on the *Hexaemeron*.[1] The *Allocutio* is contained in the work of Gregory a presbyter of Caesarea on the

[1] Both are printed in *P.G.* xviii—*Allocutio*, pp. 673 ff., *Commentarius*, pp. 708–793.

Nicene Fathers, a work dating from the early years of the tenth century. When we analyse this oration, it is obvious that it is the product of a later age when the Trinitarian doctrine was firmly established, and that the author has put into the mouth of Eustathius his own ideas concerning the Council of Nicaea.[1] Perhaps, as Bardenhewer suggests,[2] it is the work of Gregory himself. The work on the *Hexaemeron* was first published, together with a commentary on it, by Allatius in 1629.[3] Although it is possible that the work is almost contemporaneous with Eustathius,[4] it is generally agreed that it is spurious. It opens with a detailed account of the creation, its author enumerating the different trees, plants, fishes, birds, and beasts that were created. He describes the rise of the peoples of the earth through the genealogies in the early chapters in Genesis, and discourses on the genealogies of the Patriarchs. This is followed by the genealogy of Christ and excerpts from the *Protevangelium*. Returning to the Old Testament, he relates incidents from the life of Joseph, and gives an embellished account of Moses and the Exodus. He concludes the work, if he intended that it should be concluded here, with a few details from the history of Joshua. As a literary production the *Commentarius in Hexaemeron* is worthless. It is little more than a jumble of passages taken from the Old Testament, Josephus' *Antiquities*, the *Praeparatio* of Eusebius, and the *Protevangelium*. It is quite clear that it would be doing a gross injustice to Eustathius if we were to ascribe the work to his pen. His mind, as we shall see from his *de Engastrimytho*, was of a far higher quality than that of the author of this

[1] Compare the following extract: *τὸ τῆς ἀγνωσίας ἀπελαύνεται σκότος· τῷ τῆς θεογνωσίας φωτὶ ἡ οἰκουμένη καταυγάζεται. πατὴρ δοξολογεῖται· υἱὸς συμπροσκυνεῖται· τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καταγγέλλεται· τριὰς ὁμοούσιος, μία θεότης ἐν τρισὶ προσώποις καὶ ὑποστάσεσι κηρύττεται.* The writer's condemnation of the teaching of Arius may also be noted: *τὸν γὰρ μονογενῆ υἱὸν καὶ λόγον τοῦ πατρὸς ἀποστερεῖν τῆς ὁμοουσιότητος τοῦ πατρὸς οὐκ ἐντρέπεται, καὶ τῇ κτίσει τὸν κτίστην ὁ κτιστολάτρης συναριθμεῖν ἐπείγεται.*

[2] *Gesch. der altkirchlichen Literatur*, iii, p. 232.

[3] Allatius' commentary is printed in *P.G.* xviii, pp. 795 ff.

[4] References are made to the thirtieth year of Constantine's rule, *i.e.* the year 335: *P.G.* xviii, p. 760.

work, who, apparently, was a man devoid of literary taste and originality.[1]

Now we turn to the Homily on Mary, Martha and Lazarus which Cavallera discovered in a seventeenth-century manuscript in the library at Leyden, the part of the manuscript which contains the Homily having been copied from a manuscript dating from the tenth century. The Homily is based on the supper at Bethany, recorded in St John xii, and is didactic in purpose, seeking to direct its readers into channels of orthodox belief concerning the Person of Christ. Its style is highly rhetorical. Let us look at some of the ideas it contains.

The work opens with St John's account of the supper at which Lazarus, who had been raised from the dead, was present. Discoursing upon it, the author says that in this way spiritual food was prepared for the guests, that they might be saved through faith in Him "who is ever glorified together on high with the Father and the Holy Spirit".[2] The Saviour, he says, came to cast fire on the earth which He made, and its light did He manifest in Lazarus as a sign to the Jews, for, through the miracle, He revealed Himself to be God, seeing He is "as the brightness of the sun in the sun, as the sun in a ray, without division and without change, because He is co-essential and subsists in His own might".[3] So the writer can say that at the supper the clay sat down with Him who fashioned it.[4] Then the author turns to Martha's confession (St John xi, 27), and Mary's act of love. Martha, he says, was a second Peter, who confessed "Thou art the Christ", "not a common Christ, a man, but Son of the living God, the Logos made flesh without change for our sakes, the only Son of the living God".[5] So he interprets her

[1] It is possible, of course, that Eustathius wrote on the Hexaemeron, for it is quite apparent that he was a keen student of the Old Testament. Moreover, the fact that Anastasius Sinaita has produced what he believes to be a quotation from the work (see below, p. 68, n. 1)—though it is not to be found in the above and is probably spurious—seems to show that traditionally he was associated with such a work.

[2] Cavallera, *In Lazarum*, p. 30. [3] *L.c.* p. 32.

[4] *L.c.* p. 35. In the same way the author says that Martha received under her roof the Creator and Lord of the angels (*l.c.* p. 36).

[5] *L.c.* p. 38: ὁ λόγος ὁ γενόμενος σὰρξ ἄτρεπτος δι' ἡμᾶς.

confession in these words: "Thou art the First-born and the Only-begotten and Sole with the Holy Spirit, both co-essential, and of the same honour, and of equal power with the Begetter, both without beginning and co-eternal with the Father".[1] Nothing, he says, could separate the brother and the two sisters from their faith in "Christ Jesus, one of the uncreated and co-essential Trinity".[2] Unshaken by every assault they were ready to confess the Son of God to be God and man without division (ἀδιαιρέτως) and without confusion (ἀσυγχύτως).[3] Mary, he says, took the ointment, and anointed the living temple which proceeded from the Virgin Mother of God, and which was united to God the uncreated and Creator of all things.[4] She was like Jacob; yet she surpassed him. He but anointed the stone, a type of the corner stone; she anointed "the holy and living and divinely-created temple of the uncreated and eternal God".[5] So from the eyes of the sisters the weakly vesture of the flesh did not hide the glory of the invisible God. Nay, they marvelled the more at His voluntary poverty, and in their love ministered to "the one and same in the union, God and perfect man".[6] Later, the author answers the objection of the Jew, who, he says, will regard such thoughts as blasphemy, seeing it is written, "No one shall see my face and live". He points out that the Jew should remember that Jacob saw God and his life was spared, for God is all-powerful and manifests Himself to worthy ones as He wills. So also

> Mary saw God made man without change (ἀτρέπτως), and poured her libation of fragrance upon His holy and co-worshipped temple, that is (she saw) Him in Himself, for undivided is the union, and without confusion (ἀσύγχυτον) the mystery of godliness, and without division (ἀδιαίρετος) the confession of Him who is one of the Trinity, the Lord Jesus Christ.[7]

The Jews, he continues, are like Judas who murmured against the divine ordering at the supper. He was rebuked, but Mary was commended (St Matthew xxvi, 13). She understood the scripture

[1] *L.c.* p. 39. [2] *L.c.* p. 40. [3] *L.c.* p. 40.
[4] *L.c.* p. 41. [5] *L.c.* p. 42. [6] *L.c.* p. 44.
[7] *L.c.* p. 48.

(Song of Songs i, 12), and knew Him to be "King of Kings and Lord of Lords".

With Mary [the author concludes] may we all know one and the same, and, worshipping the Lord, who before the ages, both co-eternally and likewise without beginning, both ineffably and beyond all utterance, was begotten of the Father, that is of the uncreated substance, and who in the last days, in a manner beyond comprehension and expression, was incarnate of the immaculate Virgin, without change (ἀμεταβλήτως) and without confusion (ἀσυγχύτως), acquire the blessedness which is of Him in mercy and life perpetual, for His is the glory with the Father and the Holy Spirit for ever and ever. Amen.[1]

There the Homily ends, and we are left with the impression that it is the work of a later age when the Church's doctrine of the Trinity and the Person of Christ was fully established. Yet Cavallera holds that it is a genuine work of Eustathius, and brings forward three arguments in support of his assertion. He notices that the same parallel between Mary anointing the feet of Christ and Jacob anointing the pillar at Bethel is to be found in one of the fragments which, presumably, he accepts as genuine; he tries to show that from a doctrinal point of view the Homily is consistent with the other works of Eustathius; he would prove that the same literary style is to be found in the Homily, in the *de Engastrimytho*, and in the genuine fragments. The "crucial test", as it has been termed,[2] lies in Cavallera's second argument, for the first and the third are open to serious objections.[3] But

[1] *L.c.* p. 50.

[2] So Srawley, in his review of Cavallera's *In Lazarum*: *J.T.S.* vol. ix, pp. 107–109. Two French reviews of the work are to be found in *Revue d'Hist. ecclés.* viii (1907), pp. 330–331, and *Bulletin de Littér. ecclés.* 1906, p. 212, the former by C. Baur, the latter by L. Saltet. Both agree that the Homily is spurious.

[3] Cavallera's first argument has no secure foundation, though he calls it a "*validissimum argumentum*" (*l.c.* p. 10). We are inclined to think that the fragment (Cav. Frag. 13; *P.G.* xviii, 696, 697) is not genuine. (See below, p. 68, n. 2.) In preparing his third argument Cavallera has been most painstaking, though we must confess that we fail to see the worth of his labours. He has brought forward a series of numerical tables wherein he compares the use of nouns, adjectives, verbs, etc. in the Homily with their use in the fragments and the *de Eng.* Baur's comment in the review mentioned above is very apt: *Est-ce donc dans le*

surely enough has been said above to make it quite clear that the Homily reveals a developed Trinitarian and Christological teaching. Moreover, the author does not fail to make free use of the principle of the *communicatio idiomatum*, as we have noticed already.[1] It is true, as Cavallera points out, that like Eustathius he uses the word "temple" (*ναός*) when speaking of Christ's manhood, but he uses it with a different meaning.[2] In the next two chapters we shall deal with the doctrinal teaching of Eustathius as it is to be gathered from the genuine fragments, and we shall find then that we are in a theological world where no such settlement of doctrinal matters has been reached. Instead of the Trinitarian teaching of the Homily we shall mark an insistence on the one Divinity, and instead of an Incarnation, so much upheld by the author of the Homily, we shall be face to face with what is but a divine indwelling. Again, when we regard the contents of the Homily in the light of what we know to be the genuine teaching of Eustathius, we find that the principal features of that teaching are missing. There is not to be found therein the common Eustathian insistence on the human soul of Christ,[3] and its author fails to draw the distinction between the two natures in Christ as Eustathius so often does.[4] Moreover, the terms used by Eustathius when he describes the divine and the human natures in Christ, and their mode of union, are simply

seul nombre *des préfixes, prépositions, etc. que se manifestent les notes caractéristiques d'un écrivain?* One has but to read the Homily, after having read the fragments in Migne and the *de Engast.*, to feel confident that one is face to face with a different author. The rhetorical style of the Homily is not to be found in the genuine works; neither is the archaic cast of the genuine works to be found in the Homily.

[1] See above, p. 63, n. 4.

[2] Although Cavallera says that this is "*non leve argumentum*" (*l.c.* p. 14) we disagree with him entirely. For the author of the Homily *ναός* is embraced in the circle of ideas where it becomes the human organ of the one Person. So he can describe it as *ζωηφόρος* and *συμπροσκύνητος* (*l.c.* pp. 44, 48). In fact the teaching of the Homily comes very near to Docetism. Eustathius, on the other hand, insists on the complete manhood of Christ, and this, it seems, he regarded as personal. For him *ὁ ναός* is *ὁ ἄνθρωπος*. Clearly, the two ideas are poles apart.

[3] See below, pp. 105–108.

[4] See below, pp. 112–114.

not to be found.[1] The teaching of the Homily and that of Eustathius represent two widely different ages, and if we are to understand the latter aright we must without any hesitation abandon the Homily as spurious.[2] Perhaps we shall not be wrong if we place it well after the Council of Chalcedon which was held in 451.[3]

We would also place certain fragments in the same category. Three Syriac fragments from a supposed work *adversus Photinum, id est Morinum*[4] were brought to light by Cowper in his *Syriac Miscellanies*.[5] Cavallera publishes them in his collection,[6] though he cannot believe that they are genuine, since, according to his view, Eustathius died before 337 and Photinus only came into prominence in 343. The doctrinal thought contained in the fragments leads one to the same conclusion. This thought concerns the difference between "nature" and "person". The author is at pains to show that when he says "three persons" he does not mean "three Gods". Rather, "we do not say three Gods because we do not say three natures". "For one is the person indeed, but the nature another....Now since we say that

[1] Thus the author never uses the common Eustathian phrases, *ὁ θεὸς καὶ λόγος* and *ὁ λόγος καὶ θεός*. He never speaks of the divine nature as *τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα*, or *ἡ σοφία*, or *τὸ θεῖον τῆς σοφίας πνεῦμα*. With regard to the manhood we never find this author using *ὁ ἄνθρωπος* or *ἄνθρωπος* as Eustathius does. His use of *ἄνθρωπος* is in accordance with orthodox formulae (see use of "man," p. 63). The Eustathian expressions for the mode of the union of the two natures in Christ (such as *φορεῖν*, *οἰκεῖν*, *διαιτᾶσθαι*, *συνδιαιτᾶσθαι*) are altogether missing.

[2] Both Loofs (*Nestorius*, p. 108 n.) and Bardenhewer (*l.c.* p. 236) regard it as spurious. The latter says that "the many Trinitarian and Christological formulae plainly betray a more advanced stage in the historical development of dogma".

[3] The frequent use of the Chalcedonian adverbs *ἀδιαιρέτως*, *ἀτρέπτως*, and *ἀσυγχύτως* makes this conclusion almost certain.

[4] Morinus appears to have been another nickname for Photinus, based on *μωρός*, "fool". We are already aware that he was sometimes called Scotinus, "Son of Darkness", a perversion of his name Photinus, "Son of Light".

[5] P. 60.

[6] Frags. 79, 80, 80[2]. Frag. 79 (the first in Cowper's *Miscellanies*) contains the unusual expression: "The beautiful Word of the Father is his sister in part". Perhaps it could be explained from the original Syriac, but Cowper does not make it clear whence he derived these three fragments.

the nature of the Person is one, of necessity we say that there is only one God". We would only add that teaching of this sort is not to be found in the genuine works of Eustathius, who in strictest terms upholds the one Divinity. What he means by it we shall attempt to show in the next chapter.

Neither can we accept the fragments from his supposed works on St John's Gospel. According to Anastasius Sinaita, Eustathius wrote a Commentary on the Gospel, chapter xxvi of which contained a refutation of Celsus.[1] The fragment preserved by Anastasius seems to reflect the days of the controversies concerning the two wills in Christ. Three Syriac fragments on Johannine passages have come down to us.[2] The first, on *The Word was made flesh*, betrays itself when it speaks of those "*qui, illud cruci affigentes, Verbum occiderant Deum.*" Eustathius carefully distinguished the natures, and railed against those who would make the Divine suffer. In the second, we have his supposed comment on the words spoken at the wedding in Cana, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" But in referring the words to the one person, as it seems, it is contrary to the spirit of Eustathius.[3] The third fragment contains the word θεοτόκος. Although it is used by Eusebius of Caesarea, we cannot imagine that Eustathius, who insists upon the fact that Mary begat the man and not the Logos, would employ the term.[4] Perhaps we should also place here a fragment from a supposed work *On the Samaritan Woman*.[5] Nothing like it is to be found in the genuine fragments. It seems fairly clear then, that if Eustathius wrote on the Fourth Gospel nothing that is trustworthy has reached us.

[1] Cav. Frag. 42; *P.G.* lxxxix, 118.

[2] Cav. Frags. 43, 44, 45; *Analecta Sacra*, iv, 210, 211 (Syriac), 441, 442 (Latin).

[3] *Verum humana dixit, cum defecit vinum iis qui cum eo bibebant.... Ipse autem respondens dixit "Quid mihi et tibi, mulier?" dicere volens ipsius horam nondum venisse....* It seems clear that the writer regarded the "*ipse*" as the subject of divine and human experiences. Eustathius separates the experiences. See below, pp. 112 ff.

[4] Eusebius, *c. Marcellum*, ii, 1; Klostermann, *l.c.* p. 32. See Eustathius' interpretation of Gal. iv, 4 (below, p. 113).

[5] Cav. Frag. 45[2]. The passage is difficult to understand, but at any rate τὴν τοῦ κυρίου παναγίαν σάρκα is not Eustathian.

Certain fragments we must reject as spurious because they follow the allegorical rather than the literal mode of interpreting the Scriptures. We shall see when we come to consider the *de Engastrimytho* that Eustathius was a true Antiochene in maintaining the latter against the former. This would seem to give us sufficient authority for rejecting the quotation of Anastasius Sinaita from a supposed work dealing with the Creation,[1] and the fragment dealing with the vision of Jacob at Bethel, which purports to come from one of his genuine works, Περὶ Στηλογραφίας.[2]

Almost everything that has reached us from his work *On Melchizedek* must be set down as spurious. Yet Eustathius certainly wrote on the subject, perhaps addressing the work to Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria.[3] Jerome, in answering the letter of the presbyter Evangelus who had written to him to obtain his

[1] The quotation is printed in Cavallera (Frag. 1). Anastasius in Bk. ix, *c.* 994 (*P.G.* lxxxix) of his *In Hexaemeron* says that Genesis ii, 19 has been interpreted in different ways. Some hold, he remarks, that these and the first birds and beasts are the same; others, that a different creation is predicted. He then produces the long quotation purporting to come from Eustathius in which the second interpretation is followed. According to this the *adhuc* or the ἔτι of the text is given a special significance, and this second creation is said to represent the ecclesiastical peoples who are gathered together in Paradise. Alexandria, and not Antioch, is the home of such scriptural exegesis.

[2] Cav. Frag. 13; *P.G.* xviii, 696, 697. According to this fragment Jacob sees the bodily form of Christ, the ladder represents the Cross, and, in recognising the place as the gate of heaven, the Patriarch understands that through the divine work of Christ men would be able to draw nigh to the divine nature. It is altogether inconsistent, of course, with Eustathius' mode of exegesis. Pitra says (*Spic. Solesm.* i, 351, n. 3) that he has found nothing like it save in the works of Germanus of Constantinople (seventh century). Perhaps a scribe, knowing that Eustathius wrote a work εἰς τὰς ἐπιγραφὰς τῆς στηλογραφίας (see below, p. 72) falsely attributed to him this work on the στήλη of Jacob. Perhaps the second half of the title (ἔνθα περὶ τοῦ νομοθέτου Μωσέως τὸν λόγον ποιεῖται) has been added because it was known that Eustathius wrote a work περὶ Ἑβραϊσμοῦ (see below, p. 71).

[3] See below, p. 69, n. 4. Perhaps Alexander had sought his aid against the teaching of Hieracas and his followers. This scholarly ascetic of Leontopolis, who flourished towards the end of the third century, identified Melchizedek with the Holy Spirit (see Epiphanius, *Haer.* 55, 5; 67, 3).

opinion concerning Melchizedek, says that he has consulted the works of the ancients, and, in giving a list of his authorities, mentions the work of Eustathius.[1] But since in his reply to Evangelus he describes their common opinion in his own words, it is plainly impossible for us to recover from the letter the individual sentiments of Eustathius. Of the surviving fragments which are to be found in Cavallera's collection,[2] two have been drawn from the Catenae, and a third has been preserved in Syriac; in addition, Cavallera publishes a long fragment which purports to come from this work. The first two make Melchizedek a supernatural being, and this, surely, was not the opinion of Eustathius. Indeed, we can gather so much from the testimony of Jerome.[3] The third fragment may contain a genuine remark of Eustathius, but it ends with a sentiment which is altogether opposed to the principal thoughts of his doctrinal teaching.[4] With regard to Cavallera's long fragment, it has been pointed out that most of it is to be found word for word in an apocryphal homily on Melchizedek in Pseudo-Chrysostom, and it has been

[1] See below, n. 3.

[2] Cav. Frags. 3^1, 3^2, and 3^3. The second is printed in *P.G.* xviii, 696 B, and the third in *Analecta Sacra*, iv, 210 (Syr.), 442 (Lat.). The long fragment is to be found in Cavallera's Addenda, pp. xii–xiv.

[3] Compare his letter to Evangelus (*Ep.* 73): *deprehendi horum omnium* (*i.e.* Hippolytus, Irenaeus, Eusebius of Caesarea, Eusebius of Emesa, Apollinaris, and Eustathius) *opiniones diversis argumentationibus ac diverticulis ad unum compitum pervenisse ut dicerent Melchisedech hominem fuisse Chananaeum, regem urbis Ierosolymae....*

[4] The Latin translation of the Syriac, as published by Cavallera, runs: [*Eustathii Antiocheni*] *Eiusdem ex litteris ad Alexandrum Alexandriae episcopum, quarum argumentum erat Melchisedech: Melchisedech, cum imaginem gereret exemplaris* (τύπου) *Christi et regium characterem prae se ferret, similis quidem erat Christo. In eo vero quod permagnus erat et unctus* (χριστὸς vel κεχρισμένος) *imaginem veram et personae Christi similem exhibebat. Ioannes autem Verbum carnem factum, quod huius imaginis et characteris archetypum erat, manibus complexus in aquas demisit.* It is quite possible that the first part of the fragment is genuine. Eustathius certainly uses the term ὁ χρισθείς (*P.G.* xviii, 688 B) and often speaks of τὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ πρόσωπον (see below, p. 110). But the second part can hardly belong to him. His determination to keep the natures separate would never allow him to make such a statement. It seems that Bardenhewer (*Gesch. der altkirchlichen Literatur*, iii, p. 237) is inclined to favour the genuineness of the opening part of the fragment.

suggested that it embraces the work of more than one author.[1] It seems then, that with one possible exception no genuine portion of Eustathius' work has reached us.

We come now to what we would call the doubtful fragments. In this category we would place the supposed Eustathian quotation in the *Contestatio* of Eusebius of Dorylaeum.[2] Loofs appears to think it is genuine, but it contains no clear trace of the teaching of Eustathius. Moreover it seems that the quotation from Baruch on which it is based was commonly used for doctrinal purposes. In like manner we cannot accept the fragment preserved by Leontius of Byzantium,[3] which purports to come from Eustathius' *Interpretation of Psalm xv*, and which contains a comment on Galatians iv, 4. There is no doubt that he wrote such a work, and there is no doubt that the text from Galatians was a favourite one for purposes of doctrinal exposition, but the spirit of the later Christological controversies pervades the wording. There has also come down to us a short fragment *ἐκ τοῦ κατηχητικοῦ λόγου*[4] which is certainly suspicious. Bardenhewer notes that it is ascribed to Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, in the works of Maximus Confessor.

Several fragments are to be found in the Catenae. These are mainly interpretations of Old Testament passages, which may or may not be genuine, for while it is certain that Eustathius was a keen student of the Old Testament, it is also certain that the Catenae are often unreliable. One, or perhaps two, very short

[1] See *Revue d'Hist. ecclés.* vol. viii (1907), pp. 330–331.

[2] Cav. Frag. 82. Loofs makes use of it in his argument, *Nestorius*, p. 118, n. 3. See below, p. 95.

[3] Cav. Frag. 7 (taken from Leontius, *contra Monophysitas*, *P.G.* lxxxvi, *c.* 1840): *Ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικὸς* (Gal. iv, 4). *οὐ γενομένους ἀλλὰ γενόμενον. μοναδικὸν γὰρ τὸ πρόσωπον· οὐκ εἶπον μοναδικὴν τὴν φύσιν· ἄπαγε, μὴ γένοιτο· οὐδὲ τὴν αὐτὴν οὐσίαν σαρκὸς καὶ θεότητος, ἀλλ' εἶπον ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστόν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ διαφόρῳ τῶν φύσεων, γνωριζόμενον κατὰ πάντα.* If there was an original, as is quite likely, it seems to have been altered beyond recognition.

[4] Cav. Frag. 81: *ἐνέργεια φυσικὴ ἐστιν ἡ πάσης οὐσίας ἔμφυτος κίνησις. ἐνέργειά ἐστι φυσικὴ ἡ δηλωτικὴ πάσης οὐσίας δύναμις.* Bardenhewer, *l.c.* p. 236, n. 2, points out that it is to be found in the series of dogmatic treatises written by Maximus, which have the heading *Opuscula theologica et polemica*. See *P.G.* xci, p. 280.

fragments have reached us which purport to come from a *Homily on Joseph*.[1] Another fragment discusses the length of the day when the shadow on the dial of King Hezekiah went back ten steps.[2] We also possess a few fragments dealing with various passages in the Book of Proverbs,[3] and two on Ecclesiastes ii, 11.[4] A fragment from a work Περὶ Ἑβραϊσμοῦ has also come down to us.[5] Seemingly the work was a discussion of the purpose of the Hebrew law, but the fragment itself gives us no indication of the argument of the work or of its worth. Yet we must recognise that it is possible that Eustathius undertook a work of this character.[6]

We now arrive at the genuine fragments. They have been preserved mainly by Theodoret, his *Dialogues* containing no less than twenty-eight fragments from five of the genuine works of Eustathius. Of these works we will notice first the treatise on the *Interpretation of Psalm xv*, and that on the *Interpretation of Psalm xcii*. Only one fragment of the former treatise has reached us through Theodoret, but it is of great value in that from it we can ascertain the principles of Eustathius' teaching concerning

[1] Cav. Frags. 4^1, 4^2. Frag. 5, an interpretation of an O.T. passage (perhaps from Genesis), is without a title.

[2] Cav. Frag. 6.

[3] On Prov. iii, 13–15: Cav. Frag. 17 (*Analecta Sacra*, ii, xxxviii–ix); on Prov. xvi, 32: Cav. Frag. 38 (*Analecta Sacra*, ii, xxxix–xl); on Prov. xxiii, 33: Cav. Frag. 39; on Prov. ix, 5: Cav. Frag. 37 (*P.G.* xviii, 684 D). In view of Eustathius' interest in the O.T. there is much to be said in favour of the genuineness of these fragments. Yet it cannot be asserted definitely that they are genuine, since we have no grounds for saying that he undertook a work on the Book of Proverbs.

[4] Cav. Frags. 40^1, 40^2.

[5] Cav. Frag. 41. The fragment is preserved among the tracts attributed to Leontius and John, under the title, *de Condescendentia* (compare *P.G.* lxxxvi, 2092). It runs: *κατά τινα νομοθετικὴν ἐπίνοιαν καὶ μεταχείρησιν εἰς πειθὼ τῶν προσταττομένων ὑπ' αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ συμφέροντος, ἐν ἑκαστῷ ψεύδει χρῶνται ἐν φαρμάκων εἴδει οἱ νομοθέται δῆλον.*

[6] At this point mention can be made of those fragments in Cavallera's collection which are not commented upon elsewhere in this work. Frag. 83 is an anathema breathing of the spirit of Eustathius, though we are far from saying it is genuine. The excerpt from Chrysostom's *Homily* (Frag. 84) is very doubtful, for it seems that Chrysostom knew little of the real Eustathius. The two Eustathian Canons (Frags. 85, 86) can hardly be genuine.

the human soul of Christ.[1] The three fragments of the second work, again preserved by Theodoret, illustrate the manner in which he distinguished the two natures in Christ.[2] A fourth fragment has been preserved in Syriac, and comes down to us through Severus of Antioch.[3] We are inclined to regard it as genuine, for similar teaching is to be found in the *de Engastrimytho*. Eustathius also wrote two books on the *Titles of the Psalms*, εἰς τὰς ἐπιγραφὰς τῆς στηλογραφίας,[4] and εἰς τὰς ἐπιγραφὰς τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν.[5] Again we are indebted to Theodoret, whose *Dialogues* contain one fragment from the first, and two from the second work. These reveal Eustathius' teaching concerning the exaltation of the manhood of Christ. We are not certain, of course, but we think it likely that these works were written before the rise of Arius, while Eustathius was enjoying the peace of Beroea, for they contain no mention of the tenets of his opponents.[6]

We must also place here his *de Anima contra Philosophos* if it was published as a separate work.[7] It is possible that it formed

[1] *P.G.* xviii, 685 D. (Quoted below, p. 106, n. 1.)

[2] *L.c.* 688 A. (Quoted below, p. 113.)

[3] Cav. Frag. 9 [*Analecta Sacra*, iv, 212–213 (Syr.), 442 (Lat.)]. Compare *de Engastrimytho*, 65, 4. See note on pp. 126, 127, where both are printed together.

[4] *P.G.* xviii, 685 B. Psalms xv, lv–lix (LXX) have the title στηλογραφία.

[5] *L.c.* 685 C. Psalms cxix–cxxxiii (LXX) have the title ᾠδὴ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν.

[6] It is possible that in composing these works he had in mind the Alexandrine publications (especially those of Origen), written from the point of view of that school. If this was the case, perhaps he aimed at furnishing the theological world with commentaries based on the Antiochene mode of exegesis.

[7] The evidence does not help us to arrive at a definite conclusion. The title of the three fragments published by Mai (see next note) is: περὶ ψυχῆς κατὰ φιλοσόφων. The fragment (*P.G.* xviii, 689 C) preserved by Eustratius, the presbyter of Constantinople in the sixth century, bears the title: περὶ ψυχῆς καὶ κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν. On the other hand, Theodoret always gives the title simply as "περὶ ψυχῆς", though it is clear that he derives all his quotations from the work (or the part of the one work) directed against the Arians. Jerome (*de Vir. Illust.* 85) refers to the work as "*de Anima*." The fragments found in the *Sacra Parallela* (*P.G.* xviii, 692 A) also give the title as "περὶ ψυχῆς". Cavallera (*In Lazarum*, p. 86) is inclined to favour the view that both parts were contained in the one work (*de Anima*), but it seems best to regard the matter as an open question.

part—and as such was directed against the philosophers—of one work, the *de Anima*, the other part being directed against the Arians. If it was issued separately, there is no reason against the assumption that it was written prior to the Arian controversy. Three fragments of the work have reached us. These were first brought to light by Mai, and are to be found in Cavallera's collection.[1] Their literary style reveals the same archaic manner of expression that we find in the genuine works. Like Gregory of Nyssa,[2] who wrote on the same subject some years afterwards, Eustathius, it seems, attacked the Pythagorean conception of the transmigration of souls and the soul-rotation of Platonism.[3] From the "estate" of newly-born children he proves that the soul is not unbegotten, but that it increases with the body, and forms the moving principle of man's bodily existence.[4] Perhaps when he composed the work he had in mind Origen's teaching of the eternal creation of souls, and perhaps in some measure it was directed against that teaching.[5]

With the outbreak of the Arian controversy he took up his pen and wrote mercilessly against the members of the Eusebian party. We have already noticed that probably before 328 or 329 he wrote his *Homily on Proverbs viii*, 22.[6] Theodoret gives us some fifteen fragments from this work.[7] In addition one Greek and three Syriac fragments have survived, and these, we think, may be accepted as genuine.[8] We can well believe that it was a laudable

[1] Cav. Frags. 46, 47, 48; *P.G.* lxxxvi, 2, 2037–2040; Mai, *Script. vet. nova Coll.* p. 85.

[2] See his *de Anima et Resurrectione.*

[3] Thus he refutes the philosophical conception that the soul drinks of the waters of Lethe before each new birth.

[4] For quotations to illustrate this, see below, p. 105 n.

[5] The concluding words of Frag. 46 (Cav.)—Αἰγυπτίοις *χρησάμενοι καθηγεμόσιν*—may possibly have some reference to Origen.

[6] See above, pp. 36, 37. [7] *P.G.* xviii, 676 c–684 c.

[8] The Greek fragment is to be found in Cavallera's collection (Frag. 33, where he has emended the text) and in *Analecta Sacra*, ii, xxxix. (Quoted below, p. 111, n. 8.) For the three Syriac fragments see Cavallera, Frags. 34, 35, 36, and *Analecta Sacra*, iv, 213 (Syr.), 443 (Lat.), extracts 8, 9, and 10. The MS. in which the three Syriac fragments are to be found (B.M. Add. 12157) is a work of Severus and Wright (*Catal.* ii, pp. 550–554) dates it "sixth or seventh century". The expression *ὁ ἄνθρωπος*

work, exposing alike the intrigue and the teaching of his adversaries. About this time, either just before or soon after his deposition, he wrote his *de Anima et contra Arianos*, in which, as we saw in the last chapter, he struck at the heart of their teaching.[1] Theodoret has preserved six fragments from the work.[2] Two others are preserved in the *Sacra Parallela* attributed to John of Damascus,[3] and another is found in the work of Eustratius the Presbyter in the sixth century, from which Allatius in his *de Purgatorio* derived the quotation containing the words of Eustathius.[4] The last fragment is of particular interest in that it discloses his teaching concerning the presence of the human soul of Christ in Hades. Similar teaching is to be found in the *de Engastrimytho*,[5] so we are ready to accept the fragment as genuine. The fragments in the *Sacra Parallela* are very short, but there seems to be no reason for rejecting them.

We have outlined already some of the features of the last genuine work of Eustathius, that is, his *contra Arianos*.[6] It is strange that none of the fragments which are left have come to us through Theodoret. In this case we are largely dependent on

τοῦ χριστοῦ (*homo Christi*) is to be found in all four fragments (see below). As it is used more than once by Eustathius in the genuine fragments (*e.g. P.G.* xviii, 685 c, and 693) we have here something greatly in favour of their genuineness. [I am indebted to Prof. Burkitt for sending me a revised translation of the three Syriac fragments. He points out that Pitra in *Analecta Sacra* is inaccurate in translating the original Syriac *homo Christus*. "In each case the Syriac is *Barnāsheh da-Mshīḥā, i.e. hominem Christi*." He translates the fragments as follows: Cav. Frag. 34 (*A.S.* Extract 8): *Quando igitur ait:* "*Creavit me initium viarum suarum operibus suis*" *claro demonstrat argumento bonorum principium immutabile nobis exstitisse hominem Christi quoniam aptat nos ad viam caelorum.* Cav. Frag. 35 (*A.S.* Extract 9): "What wonder or worthy of astonishment that we say 'Of old ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ χριστοῦ was known by God and (δὲ) in the depth of the Divine Mind fixedly fitted'?" Cav. Frag. 35 (*A.S.* Extract 10): "If therefore *Nobis factus primum est Sapientia* (1 Cor. i, 30), well then (ἄρα) he (*i.e.* Scripture) names Him *hominem Christi* and here 'Wisdom'."]

[1] See above, p. 51. On the title of the work, which may have been simply *de Anima*, see above, p. 72, n. 7.

[2] *P.G.* xviii, 688 c–689 b.

[3] *L.c.* 692 a.

[4] *L.c.* 689 c, d.

[5] See *de Engastrimytho* (Jahn's edit.) 55, 3 ff. and 55, 12 ff.

[6] See above, pp. 52, 53.

Facundus of Hermione and Pope Gelasius.[1] A short fragment comes from the *Sacra Parallela*,[2] and perhaps with Migne we may place here another fragment without a title.[3] The fragments adduced by Facundus need careful handling, for we feel that in more cases than one we have not the *ipsissima verba* of Eustathius. Perhaps, in his desire to show that the sentiments of Theodore of Mopsuestia were those of Eustathius, he took liberties with the Eustathian text.[4] In two places in the fragments adduced by Gelasius[5] we are inclined to think there has been a mistranslation. Nevertheless, there seems to be no doubt that they are genuine, and that Eustathius wrote this mighty work in eight books to show the world the worthlessness of the Arian position.

We now turn to the only complete work which has come down to us. We mean, of course, his *de Engastrimytho contra Origenem*[6]. This was written after 311,[7] and, presumably, before the Nicene Council in 325. It appears that a certain Eutropius had asked Eustathius for his opinion on the story of the Witch of Endor,[8] since he found it difficult to accept Origen's interpretation despite its great popularity. So Eustathius complied with his request, and composed a work which must be counted as one of the finest literary products of the ante-Nicene age. It is true that he shows a bitter spirit against Origen,[9] but when this is left out of account

[1] *P.G.* xviii, 692 C, and whole of p. 693. [2] *L.c.* 696 A. [3] *L.c.* 696 A.
[4] See below, p. 109, n. 2. [5] See below, p. 100, n. 5.

[6] The treatise was first brought to light from a Vatican manuscript by Leo Allatius in 1629. In 1886 A. Jahn corrected the text with the aid of a Munich manuscript (Cod. Monacensis, 331, dating from the eleventh century), producing a critical edition of the work (together with the text of Origen's *de Engastrimytho*) in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, ii, 4. See Jahn's Introduction, pp. xiii ff., and (for other MSS.) Cavallera, *In Lazarum*, p. 66. (The references below are to the pages and lines in Jahn's edition.)

[7] The reference to Methodius of Olympus (martyred *c.* 311) makes this almost certain: Μεθόδιος γὰρ ὁ τῆς ἁγίας ἄξιος μνήμης (61, 16).

[8] 1 Samuel xxviii.

[9] Socrates (*H. E.* vi, 13) who includes Eustathius in the "quaternion of revilers" of Origen, is altogether unfair in his judgment. To speak of him as one of "those worthless characters, destitute of ability, who seek public fame by decrying those who excel them" is to do him a gross injustice. (See the note on p. 32 for some of the expressions of scorn which Eustathius used against Origen.)

we see behind the work a masterly mind which carefully surveys the evidence, and arrives at a definite conclusion. Writing in a clear decisive style, he forcefully maintains his convictions and brings forward reason after reason in their support.[1]

The ruling principle of his interpretation is that the power to send for souls out of Hades belongs, not to demons, but to God who is altogether Lord of all.[2] To his mind, therefore, the incident was nothing less than a devilish trick. King Saul was driven by the demon within him, and the woman was possessed in like manner. The Scriptures indeed say, he is ready to declare, that the woman saw Samuel. But what manner of old woman was she? She who promised to bring up the prophetic soul could not bring up the soul of anything. It is true, he says, that the Scriptures say that Saul perceived it was Samuel. But what trust can one place in the vision of a demented king? Nowhere at all, he points out, does the sacred writing say that Samuel came up. The truth is rather that the Engastrimythus, excited by the demon within her, described the marks of Samuel through her craftiness, and

[1] Perhaps we can best appreciate Eustathius' argument if at this point we attempt to summarise very briefly Origen's understanding of the story. His standpoint is that Samuel was in Hades preparing the souls for the coming of Christ, and that the words of the story are to be attributed to the Holy Spirit. To those who cannot hold that Samuel, the prophet with such a godly past, was in Hades, but affirm that the woman lied when she said she saw him, he points out that the Scriptures do not say "The woman saw a demon which pretended to be Samuel", but "The woman saw Samuel". Are these things written, he asks, or are they not written? Are they true or are they not true? The words are those of the Holy Spirit. A demon could not know that the kingdom was to be taken from the hand of Saul; neither could a demon know that Saul and his sons were to die on the following day. Moreover, who is greater, Samuel or Jesus Christ? Christ was in Hades, as Psalm xv testifies. He went there as Chief Physician. Then why should it be thought out of place for the physicians to go there and announce his coming? The gods, whom the woman said she saw ascending, were the souls of the holy prophets, for the holy Samuel could not be separated from the holy ones. Even angels were there. Patriarchs, prophets, and all men looked for the coming of Christ, the Way and the Door to the Tree of Life. The flaming sword cut off the way, but with His coming that way was opened, and men could then pass through without any hurt (Jahn's edit. *Texte und Untersuchungen*, ii, 4).

[2] This is his central theme: 25, 17; 52, 21; 63, 8; 75, 19.

in consequence the demented Saul thought it was the prophet (§§ 1–3).

Moreover he would prove that it was not Samuel. If Samuel appeared in bodily form, why did not Saul see him, he asks? Was the monarch as blind in his eyes as he was in his understanding? And how can one assume that he was without a body seeing that the woman said she saw a man erect[1] coming up and that he was clothed with a mantle? A man erect is the sign of a body in a good state of health, and surely the mantle had not remained in the tomb till that day that the soul might cover its nakedness (§§ 4–6).

Then he goes on to show how the scripture should be interpreted. The writer clearly marks the character of the incident when he calls the woman an "Engastrimythus", for in this way he declares that everything is due to trickery. To illustrate his point, Eustathius brings forward the account of the false prophets on Mt Carmel,[2] and the account of the enchantments of the Egyptian magicians at the time of the Exodus.[3] Would anyone infer, he asks, that these prophets prophesied the truth, or that the magicians performed wonders like Moses and Aaron? The writer purposely described them as false prophets and as magicians that the obvious conclusions might be drawn from the mere mention of their name. So here, by introducing the woman as an Engastrimythus, it is to be understood that he is recounting something altogether false (§§ 7–9).

That it was a piece of devilish trickery Eustathius shows from the fact that Saul fell down and did obeisance. The devil, he says, is accustomed to set himself up as God, as the prophets have declared.[4] He seeks to be worshipped, for did he not look upon the person of Christ and tempt Him to worship him? Saul, therefore, besieged by the demon within him, fell a victim to his deception. Had it been Samuel, without a doubt he would have rebuked him for such worship. Moreover, it was the devil's

[1] Here, as throughout the work, Eustathius is following the Septuagint, which has *ἄνδρα ὄρθιον* for the אִישׁ זָקֵן of the Hebrew (1 Sam. xxviii, 14).

[2] 1 Kings xviii, 29. [3] Exodus vii, 10–12, 22; viii, 7.

[4] Isaiah xiv, 13, 14; Ezekiel xxviii, 2, 26.

device to make it appear from his words that he had power over righteous souls, and that, though they were unwilling, they were compelled to obey his commands.[1] But it is a sheer fallacy. St Paul by the power of his word evoked the spirit of the Engastrimythus at Philippi,[2] and Samuel and the Apostle were like-minded. Then what power could the demon possess to be able to call up Samuel? And had it been Samuel, he would have brought the King to his senses by reminding him of the injunctions of the Law,[3] with which the prophet had been conversant from childhood (§§ 10, 11).

The Engastrimythus, Eustathius points out, declared nothing new. The words concerning the rending of the kingdom from the hand of Saul were uttered by Samuel on the occasion of the defeat of Amalek, while he was still alive, and these the demon deceitfully appropriated as its own. Moreover, what she foretold concerning the death of Saul and Jonathan did not come to pass.[4] Saul did not die on the following day, for the scripture says he was a day and a night without food after the apparition.[5] And how could the disobedient Saul be with Samuel or with Jonathan, whose manner of life was so excellent, since there is a gulf between the righteous and the unrighteous? Moreover, the scripture says that three sons of Saul perished with their father.[6] Then the woman prophesied falsely when she made out that Jonathan alone was to meet his death (§§ 12–15).

Origen is then taken to task for not paying sufficient attention to the words of scripture. He asked: "Is this written or is it not written? Is it true or is it not true?" Eustathius retorts by saying that he must be plagued with sheer stupidity if he believes in the words of a demented woman. The scripture says that the devil

[1] So interpreting 1 Sam. xxviii, 15: "Why hast thou disquieted me to bring me up?"

[2] Acts xvi, 16–18.

[3] Eustathius points out that Samuel would have reminded Saul of such passages as Lev. ix, 31 and Deut. xviii, 11.

[4] Sam. xxviii, 19. Eustathius, it appears, had a text of LXX which read *καὶ σὺ αὔριον καὶ ὁ υἱός σου Ἰωνάθαν μετ' ἐμοῦ.*

[5] Thus interpreting LXX *ἔφαγεν* (1 Sam. xxviii. 20). The Hebrew (אָכַל) has been translated as a pluperfect in A.V. and R.V. [6] 1 Sam. xxxi, 2.

proclaims himself to be God. Ought we then to believe that he is God? He boasts that he possesses the earth. Ought we to believe that he is its Creator? Moreover, Origen says that Christ was in Hades. He manifests the lack of a well-ordered understanding when he makes such a thoughtless statement. Rather was it the soul of the human tabernacle which descended into the parts below and redeemed souls of like nature; the Logos is present everywhere in virtue of the Divinity (§§ 16–19).

Eustathius carries his refutation of Origen's interpretation even further. That magniloquent person holds that the holy souls of the prophets came up at the same time, inasmuch as it says that the woman saw gods ascending. Nay, not being satisfied with such madness, he would even say that angels came up. Surely, he must be more demented than the woman herself. He would bring insult upon holy men, and altogether misrepresent the order of angelic beings who do not go down to Hades but stand before God in service. Moreover, he does not hesitate to call the story of the Creation a fable, and yet he accepts the fable in the belly! He has allegorised the account of the wells dug by Abraham's servants, the earrings and bracelets of Rebekah, and he wears himself out when he utters his nonsense concerning the daughters of Job. The story of the raising of Lazarus he treats allegorically, and when he writes on the stone-throwing recorded in St John's Gospel, he understands the stones to mean words. This empty talk of his has filled the world with unmeasurable nonsense. He has treated everything allegorically; the words of the Engastrimythus he could not allegorise (§§ 20–22).

Again, this person of massive learning holds that a demon could not know that the kingdom had been granted to David. How can the man be honoured as a person of sensible mind and excellent understanding? Of course demons could know these things, for if they recognised the Kingdom of Christ, which was invisibly anointed by the Holy Spirit, could they not the more easily recognise the kingdom of David since he had been anointed visibly by the prophet? Then Eustathius brings forward scriptural witness[1] to prove that with one voice the Engastrimythi are

[1] Deut. xiii, 1–3; xviii, 9–12; Levit. xx, 27; Isaiah viii, 19–20.

condemned as workers of hateful practices, and points out that King Manasseh is blamed for introducing them, while King Josiah is commended for his zeal in rooting them out.[1] Yet Origen, he says, who thinks he has interpreted all the Scriptures, pretends not to know all this testimony. He is not put to shame either by the decrees of the Law or by the consistent witness of prophets and historians (§§ 23–26).

Even the name "Engastrimythus" does not convince him. The word means "a myth in the belly", and a myth is a pure fabrication. Plato has made it clear how much truth there is in a myth, and when he says that the songs of Hesiod and Homer are false myths, though they may delight the ear and make for eloquent speech, how much more must one hold that the words of a demented old woman are false?[2] (§§ 27–29).

So, Eustathius concludes, the devil lurking within the woman poured forth his fabrications, and pretended to bring up the persons of the dead. But angelic beings and righteous men scoff at his pretended powers, for it belongs only to Almighty God and His divine Son to bring up souls out of Hades[3] (§ 30).

This praiseworthy work will stand as the permanent memorial to the literary greatness of Eustathius. Without a doubt he must have been one of the leading scholars of the Eastern Church at

[1] 2 Kings xxi, 6; xxiii, 24.

[2] The use he makes of Plato (*Rep.* ii, 376 E, 377 A–D, 378 E) is ample proof of his scholarship. Compare opinions of Soz. and Jerome, p. 81.

[3] It is interesting to note that Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 105) takes the view that all souls can fall under the power of demons, holding that the soul of Samuel was called up by the Witch. Tertullian (*de Anima*, 57) takes the opposite view. He says expressly that the soul of Samuel was not brought back by the Engastrimythus, but that it was a trick of the devil. Like Eustathius, Methodius of Olympus († *c.* 311), a renowned opponent of Origen, also wrote a work, *adversus Origenem de Pythonissa* (so Jerome, *de Vir. Illustr.* 83). The work is now lost. Perhaps the scholium which is to be found in one of Photius' extracts from Methodius' *de Resurrectione* (*P.G.* xviii, 325) may be taken as indicating his point of view: *δαιμόνιον ἦν τὸ παρὰ τῆς ἐνγαστριμύθου ἀναχθέν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ Σαμουήλ*. If Eustathius saw the work, he does not appear to have made use of it. There has also come down to us a short treatise by Gregory of Nyssa on the same subject (*P.G.* xlv, 108–113). He holds the same view as Eustathius, maintaining that the woman saw a demon which assumed the figure of the prophet.

the beginning of the fourth century. The pity is that nothing more has come down to us. It is quite clear that his was a developed mind, and that he was well-versed in the Scriptures and in the works of Greek philosophers. We do not know where he received his training, but there is no reason against the conjecture that Antioch, famed for its rhetoric, had a share in his mental upbringing. No doubt philosophical thought had its influence upon him, and of the Greek philosophical systems it is clear that Aristotelianism has left its mark, for his whole outlook is of an Aristotelian character. Perhaps his study of philosophy had a direct influence on his writings, which, as Sozomen says,[1] were famed for "classic purity of expression, sound conceptions, and beauty and grace of language".

But while with Jerome[2] we admire alike his knowledge of the Scriptures and of the heathen writings, the literary importance of Eustathius lies in the former direction. In his insistence on the literal, as against the allegorical, interpretation of the sacred writings, he is a true Antiochene and a forerunner of later worthies of the same school of thought. In this way the *de Engastrimytho* is an outstanding example of the worth of the literary outlook of the school, for it is apparent that Eustathius not only studied the text with great care,[3] but interpreted it in accordance with that principle which formed the basis of the Antiochene attitude to the Scriptures. In his passion he has nothing but scorn and rebuke for the chief upholder of the Alexandrine mode of scriptural exegesis.[4] His successors are found in the later Antiochenes who upheld the same principle, and once more revealed the glory of the school.

[1] *H.E.* ii, 19.

[2] *Ep.* 70. After mentioning several writers, including Eustathius, he adds: *Qui omnes in tantum philosophorum doctrinis atque sententiis suos resarciunt libros, ut nescias quid in illis primum admirari debeas, eruditionem saeculi, an scientiam scripturarum.*

[3] He used throughout the text of the LXX; there is no evidence to show that he had a knowledge of Hebrew.

[4] See esp. sections 21, 22 of the *de Engastrimytho*.

CHAPTER V

EUSTATHIUS' TEACHING CONCERNING GOD

In this chapter we shall deal largely with the question of the orthodoxy of Eustathius, so that by way of introduction we may well review the Church's tradition concerning his teaching. Although Eusebius of Caesarea and the Council which condemned him accused him of following the teaching of Sabellius, such an accusation is altogether inconsistent with the voice of the early Church. Athanasius[1] says he was "sound in the faith", and speaks of him as "the orthodox Confessor". Theodoret[2] calls him "the great champion of the faith" and attributes his banishment to "his fiery zeal on behalf of true religion". Chrysostom[3] sings his praises in a homily, and Jerome[4] points to him as one who sounded the call for war against Arius. At the time of the Nestorian controversy both sides appealed to him as one of the orthodox fathers with whom each party professed to be in agreement,[5] and Eusebius of Dorylaeum,[6] to show that Nestorius was but teaching the doctrines of Paul of Samosata, published his *Contestatio*, wherein he pleaded the authority of "the blessed Bishop Eustathius". About the beginning of the sixth century Fulgentius[7] mentions his name among those of other illustrious Bishops who resisted the heretics and prevented the wolves from entering into the Lord's fold. Facundus,[8] in his *Defence of the*

[1] *Hist. Arian.* 4; *de Fuga*, 3.

[2] *Ep.* 151: διὰ τὸν θερμὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐσεβείας ζῆλον. Comp. *Ep.* 145 where he calls him one of the "luminaries of the East".

[3] *P.G.* 1, 597–606. Chrysostom's main thought is that he was the watchman of the Lord against the forces of error. The Homily gives us no indication of Eustathius' teaching. (See above, p. 55.)

[4] *Ep.* 73. (Quoted above, p. 2 n.)

[5] Compare *Supplicatio* of Basil the Deacon against Nestorius and epistle of certain Eastern Bishops on his behalf. Binius, *Concil.* ii, pp. 219 and 395.

[6] Harduin, *Concil. Ephes.* i, 1, 1271. (Quoted in Loofs' *Paulus von Samosata*, 69–72.)

[7] *De verit. Praedest.* ii, 22; *P. L.* lxv, 649.

[8] viii, 4; *P. L.* lxvii, 719.

Three Chapters, says he was present at the Nicene Council "*pro recta fide*". Anastasius Sinaita,[1] in the seventh century, is ready to follow him as his guardian since he was inspired by God, and at the Second Council of Nicaea in 787 he is regarded as "the steadfast champion of the orthodox faith".[2] Clearly, the early Church was fully assured of his orthodoxy, despite all that Eusebius of Caesarea had urged against him.

Now let us turn to his teaching. He declares that God is ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ πάντων δεσπόζων θεός, and that, as St Paul writes, He is ἐπὶ πάντων.[3] He is perfect, infinite, and incomprehensible.[4] He is "omnium creator et generis opifex Deus".[5] His omnipresence is insisted upon: ὅλος οὖν ἐν παντὶ γενόμενος...τὰ πάντα πληρῶν.[6] In relation to the Son He is ὁ θειότατος πατήρ and ὁ θειότατος γεννήτωρ.[7] The Father and the only-begotten Son form a δυάς, while the μία θεότης is preserved.[8] The θεογονία is ἀληθής, and the Son is φύσει θεοῦ γνήσιος υἱός.[9] "Since like is generated of like, and offspring appear as the true images of their parents", He is the Father's image, and "bears the divine attributes of the Father's

[1] *P.G.* lxxxix, 994.
[2] *P.G.* xviii, 684. See above, p. 2 n.
[3] *De Eng.* 75, 19; 25, 18; *P.G.* xviii, 681 D.
[4] *P.G.* xviii, 685 B: ὁ πατὴρ...τέλειος, ἄπειρος, ἀπερινόητος ὤν.
[5] *P.G.* xviii, 691 C.
[6] *P.G.* xviii, 695 A.
[7] *P.G.* xviii, 681 C.
[8] *De Eng.* 65, 4. The passage runs: ἀλλὰ ἐνταῦθα μὲν τὴν δυάδα πατρός τε καὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ παριστῶν (*i.e.* Deut. xiii, 3, which he has just quoted) ἄλλον μὲν τὸν ἐκπειράζοντα κύριον ὠνόμαζεν, ἄλλον δὲ παρὰ τοῦτον εἶναι τὸν ἀγαπώμενον κύριόν τε καὶ θεόν, ἵνα ἐκ δυάδος τὴν μίαν ἀποδείξοι θεότητα καὶ τὴν ἀληθῆ θεογονίαν. In this connection we may note the similar thought contained in a Syriac fragment which has every appearance of being genuine. [Cav. Frag. 9; *Analecta Sacra*, iv, 212–213 (Syriac), 442 (Latin).] It appears to have been used by Severus of Antioch. The fragment is headed: *Patri et Filio unam esse substantiam, his verbis ostendit—Hac enim* (substantia) *ambo invisibili modo mira peragunt. Haec porro miracula multoties uni ita referunt libri divini ut dualitatem ex unitate introducant aut ex dualitate unitatem praedicent, quia Divinitatis una est substantia.*
[9] *De Eng.* 40. 4. Compare *P.G.* xviii, 688 B for a somewhat similar remark, the subject being ὁ χρίσας (in relation to the manhood of Christ).

excellency".[1] As the Scriptures record, He does not work without the Father.[2]

In speaking of the Son (*υἱός*) Eustathius uses four other terms, and it appears that he uses them synonymously. Sometimes he uses *λόγος*, sometimes *παῖς*, sometimes *σοφία*, and sometimes *πνεῦμα*. That *υἱός* and *λόγος* bear the same principal meaning may be shown from the following instances. It is but by common assent, he agrees, that the only-begotten Son is called Logos.[3] So he can say, as he does in regard to the Son, that the Logos is begotten of God and is God by nature.[4] Moreover, writing of the earthly life of Christ, in one place he says that the Son, and in another place that the Logos bore (*ἐφόρεσεν*) the manhood.[5] It can be shown, too, that Logos and *παῖς* are synonymous terms. Thus Eustathius says, *ὁ Λόγος... ἁπανταχοῦ πάρεστιν ἀθρόως*, and *πανταχοῦ πάρεστιν ἀθρόως ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ παῖς*.[6] We find that *πνεῦμα* and *σοφία* are used with the same meaning. So he describes the human *ψυχή* of Christ as *συνδιαιτωμένη τῷ λόγῳ*, and in another place speaks of *ὁ ἄνθρωπος* as *τῷ θείῳ πνεύματι συνδιαιτώμενος*;[7] again, he maintains in one place that the Logos is impassible, and in others says the same of *ἡ ἀσώματος σοφία* and *τὸ θεῖον τοῦ χριστοῦ πνεῦμα*.[8] Clearly, these terms are equivalents, as will become even more apparent when we take each in turn.

Like the Father, the Logos, too, is incomprehensible and infinite;[9] He is self-sufficient (*αὐτάρκης*);[9] He is *τὴν φύσιν θεός*,[10] and is begotten of God.[11] He is the "imago divinae substantiae".[12] He was *ἀνέκαθεν παρὰ τῷ πατρί*,[13] and *ἀνέκαθεν* has the might of dominion.[14] He is in possession of an eternal kingdom;[15] in

[1] *P.G.* xviii, 677 D. [2] *P.G.* xviii, 681 C. [3] *De Eng.* 56, 17.
[4] *P.G.* xviii, 685 C: *ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ θεὸς ὢν ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐξ αὐτοῦ*. *P.G.* xviii, 677 B: *ἔστι τὴν φύσιν θεός*.
[5] *P.G.* xviii, 677 D and C. [6] *De Eng.* 55, 1; 55, 30.
[7] *P.G.* xviii, 689 D and 681 D.
[8] *P.G.* xviii, 693 (last frag.); 684 C; 681 C.
[9] *P.G.* xviii, 677 B. [10] *P.G.* xviii, 677 B.
[11] *P.G.* xviii, 685 C. [12] *P.G.* xviii, 693.
[13] *P.G.* xviii, 677 A. [14] *P.G.* xviii, 681 A.
[15] *De Eng.* 56, 22.

fact, He possesses the very kingdom which the Father possesses.[1] He is the cause of all created things;[2] through Him angels were made, heaven and earth, and sea and depths, and stars in their courses.[3] So is He ἔργῳ καὶ πράξει παντοδύναμος.[4] He is omnipresent in virtue of the Divinity,[5] and at once encompasses all creation.[6] Being God, Eustathius can call Him ὁ θεὸς καὶ λόγος or ὁ λόγος καὶ θεός.[7]

We find similar thought when we turn to his use of σοφία. As the Logos cannot suffer, so neither can ἡ ἀνωτάτω σοφία.[8] Moreover, like the Logos, the σοφία is omnipresent. The σοφία cannot be contained within vessels like material things, and so, in respect of the Incarnation, "since it is a divine and ineffable power, it embraces and confirms both what is within and what is without the (human) temple".[9]

Very few references to πνεῦμα are to be found in the surviving works. Titles like τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα,[10] τὸ θεῖον τοῦ χριστοῦ πνεῦμα,[11] and τὸ θειότατον πνεῦμα[12] are employed, and it is noteworthy that Eustathius attacks those who would attribute "changes of affection" τῷ θείῳ πνεύματι.[13] But though the references are few, it is apparent from this, and from what has been said above,[14] that for him πνεῦμα was in some sense a synonym for λόγος. Again, though we can find but four references to παῖς, it seems clear that it is embraced in the same circle of ideas.[15] The παῖς, too, is θειότατος, and, from the reference

[1] *P.G.* xviii, 693 (second frag.). [2] *P.G.* xviii, 677 A.
[3] *De Eng.* 56, 19. Compare also *P.G.* xviii, 685 C.
[4] *De Eng.* 56, 23. [5] *De Eng.* 54, 27.
[6] *P.G.* xviii, 689 D.
[7] Eustathius is constantly using these terms, so there is no need to give any references.
[8] *P.G.* xviii, 693 (last frag.); 681 D. Compare also 684 B, where he says the same of ἡ ἀσώματος σοφία.
[9] *P.G.* xviii, 684 B. [10] *P.G.* xviii, 681 D.
[11] *P.G.* xviii, 681 C. [12] *P.G.* xviii, 685 B.
[13] *P.G.* xviii, 689 B. [14] P. 84.
[15] All are found in *de Eng.* (55, 17; 55, 30; 63, 10; 75, 19). Although παῖς is the term generally used for the exalted Lord, it seems that Eustathius employed it as a synonym for λόγος or υἱός in the sense of the divine Son. (Compare quotations above, p. 84.)

given above, we have seen already that He is regarded as being omnipresent.[1]

What judgment, then, are we to pass on Eustathius' teaching concerning God so far as we have seen it? The divine unity is clearly insisted upon, and at the same time the duality between the Father and the Son is strictly maintained. The Son is begotten of the Father, and partakes of the Father's attributes. He is like the Father. He is incomprehensible and infinite; He is the Father's image and true Son of God by nature. Moreover, it may be adduced that Eustathius speaks of the πρόσωπον[2] of the Holy Spirit, and several times mentions Him as τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.[3] This, if we understand πρόσωπον in the sense of "person", would lead us to infer that, though the fragments do not contain the word τριάς, yet Eustathius must have thought correctly of the Trinity. How then can he be accused of favouring the teaching of Sabellius, which would destroy the personal distinction between the Son and the Father? It seems to be altogether a misrepresentation of his teaching, and one may assume that Eusebius of Caesarea, in making such an accusation, had been led away from the truth through his animosity against Eustathius. Nor need the terms used be regarded as a drawback to the assumption that his teaching is orthodox, for it may be urged that he is but adopting the terminology of the day. It will be felt, too, that in maintaining the impassibility and omnipresence of the Son he is but upholding the dignity of the Godhead,[4] and when he maintains that the Incarnation did not limit that omnipresence, it may be asserted that similar teaching is to be found in Athanasius and Gregory of Nyssa.[5] Thus we may well feel

[1] It will be noticed that in each case we have used the personal pronoun, "He", when speaking of the Logos or the Son. We have introduced the pronoun here to fit in with what we say in the next paragraph, for at first sight it certainly seems that the Son is personal.

[2] He uses τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος in *de Eng.* 25, 26. But, as we shall see, he is here quoting directly from Origen's work.

[3] Compare *de Eng.* 26, 1; 26, 3; 58, 20; 67, 18. At the same time it should be noticed that more than once he uses ἅγιον πνεῦμα, without the article (63, 11 and *P.G.* xviii, 677 B).

[4] In fact he says so himself. See *P.G.* xviii, 681 D.

[5] Compare Athanasius, *Orat.* i, 42 and *de Incarn.* 17. For the teaching

inclined to accept the general purport of the judgment of Socrates, who says that he taught the individual existence of the Son, and confessed one God in three *hypostases*.[1]

This is the view of most moderns. Thus Bardenhewer[2] says: "According to the purport of his writings, Eustathius not only emphasised the full Godhead or *Homoousion* of the Son, but just as unequivocally also the personal distinction of the Son from the Father". Cavallera gives a similar verdict when he writes in his *Le Schisme d'Antioche*:[3] "The full divinity of the Word is there (*i.e.* in the teaching of Eustathius) clearly affirmed, but his distinction from the Father is equally demonstrated".

of Gregory see his *Orat. Catech.* 10, and *Ep.* 1. A quotation from *Orat.* i, 42 will illustrate the point of view of both these writers: "For as He was ever worshipped as being the Logos, and 'being in the form of God', so being what He ever was, though He became man (*οὕτως ὁ αὐτὸς ὢν καὶ ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος*) and called Jesus, He none the less has the whole creation under foot, and bending their knees to Him in this name, and confessing that the Word's becoming flesh (*τὸ γενέσθαι σάρκα τὸν λόγον*), and undergoing death in the flesh has not happened against the glory of His Godhead (*ἐπ' ἀδοξίᾳ τῆς θεότητος αὐτοῦ*), but 'to the glory of God the Father'." For them the Logos is the personal Son who came down from heaven, and took human nature upon Him that man might be restored to incorruption, and who, while quickening the body He assumed, was at the same time quickening the universe. But Eustathius' conception of the omnipresence of the Logos is quite different from this. For him the Logos "goeth out from heaven (*οὐρανόθεν ὁρμώμενος*, not *οὐρανόθεν ὁρμηθείς*) and continueth in the Father's bosom" at the same time (*P.G.* xviii, 680 D). He does not teach a definite act of divine condescension, neither does the thought of man's redemption —which formed the basis of the doctrinal outlook of both Athanasius and Gregory—enter into his teaching. (See below, p. 111, n. 7.) It seems that for Eustathius the Logos is but the impersonal attribute of the *μία θεότης*, which, having been put forth, is omnipresent as the *ἐνέργεια* of the Godhead. (See below, p. 90.) As such it dwells in the human Jesus, and at the same time "being a divine and ineffable power, it embraces and confirms both what is within and what is without the temple, and thence proceeding beyond, it comprehends and sways all matter". (For full quotation see below, p. 103.) Eustathius may say that the Logos *ἀρετῇ τῆς θεότητος* (*de Eng.* 55, 1), or *θεὸς ὤν* (*ibid.* 57, 2), or *οἷα θεός* (*ibid.* 56, 9), is present everywhere, but such expressions should be regarded from his particular point of view.

[1] *H.E.* i, 23.

[2] *Gesch. der altkirchlichen Literatur*, iii, p. 231.

[3] P. 38 n.

Similarly Burn, in his recent lecture on Eustathius,[1] remarks in his opening words,

"He fell into no heresy, so there is no need to engage in the popular task of whitewashing", and, in concluding his lecture, he says, "When I try to summarise for myself the theological teaching of S. Eustathius, I find myself repeating the familiar words, 'Perfect God and Perfect Man'. He was far-seeing in his emphasis on the true Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ.... "

From what we have seen already of Eustathius' teaching it will be felt that there are good grounds for such a conclusion. Nevertheless, we think that after all it is the result of a *prima facie* view of the records. When we reach the heart of Eustathius' teaching we seem to be face to face with quite a different conclusion. It appears to the present writer that Loofs is nearer the truth in his remarks in his *Paulus von Samosata*.[2] After pointing out that Eustathius' conception of the Logos is not that of His eternal generation from God, as it is with Origen, he continues: "Eustathius seems to think rather with 'Logos' of the Word through which God creates and carries out His will on earth, and, so far as I can see, there is no trace of the everlasting begetting", and, in the same paragraph, he adds: "the Logos for Eustathius, the advocate of the μία οὐσία or ὑπόστασις of the Father and of the Son, has or is no proper *hypostasis*". If this is true, Eustathius can be condemned of being to some extent a follower of Sabellius. Let us see what grounds there are for such a conclusion which is altogether contrary to the Church's tradition concerning him.

Setting aside the accusation which Eusebius of Caesarea brought against him, and the charge put forward at the Council which deposed him (though these facts of themselves favour our conclusion), we will base our inquiry wholly upon his writings. We must start from the point of view that he strongly insists

[1] The first (delivered in 1926) of the Annual Nicaean Lectures founded by the Society of the Faith to commemorate the 1600th anniversary of the Council of Nicaea. The above quotations are found on pp. 1 and 22. But the lecturer has not considered the teaching of Eustathius in any detail.

[2] Pp. 296, 297.

on the truth of the unity of the Godhead, for in this way he is the determined opponent of the doctrinal thought of the Eusebian party. Does he then regard the Son as the personal Being, eternally begotten of God, or is the Son for him but an attribute—and, as such, impersonal—of the one Divinity? As Loofs remarks, there is no trace in the Eustathian records of His eternal begetting, and His *hypostasis* is nowhere clearly maintained. Now we have seen already that Eustathius uses the terms λόγος, υἱός, παῖς, σοφία and πνεῦμα synonymously. When therefore we find that λόγος, σοφία and πνεῦμα are described as δύναμις, we can reasonably infer that he understands υἱός and παῖς in the same way. So in the *de Engastrimytho* he says that the human soul of Christ on its descent into Hades possessed all-surveying authority inasmuch as it had been "confirmed by a divine power on account of the co-presence of the God and Logos".[1] Again, in a fragment from his *Homily on Proverbs viii*, 22 we read that the highest Wisdom is a "divine and ineffable power".[2] Or again, interpreting words of scripture, he says in the same work: "'He lives by the power of God,' the manhood plainly dwelling together with the divine spirit, since also ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ πιστευόμενος...is shown to be the power of the Most High".[3]

But perhaps it will be urged that this evidence is far from conclusive, for after all it may be said that Eustathius probably understands δύναμις in these passages as an attribute of a personal Logos. But uncertainty seems to vanish in the light of further evidence. It will have been noticed from what has been said above that he lays great stress on the truth of the divine omnipresence. How, then, does he understand the omnipresence

[1] *De Eng.* 55, 6: θεσπεσίᾳ κεκραταίωται δυνάμει διὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ λόγου συνουσίαν.

[2] *P.G.* xviii, 684 B: ἡ ἀνωτάτω σοφία...θεία τις οὖσα καὶ ἀνέκφραστος δύναμις.

[3] *P.G.* xviii, 681 D: ζῇ γὰρ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ (2 Cor. xiii, 4) τῷ θείῳ πνεύματι δηλονότι συνδιαιτώμενος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἐπειδὴ καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ πιστευόμενος...ἀποδέδεικται. The ὁ πιστευόμενος may seem evidence against the conclusion that Eustathius did not maintain a personal Logos or Son. But surely it is only equivalent to ὁ λόγος or ὁ υἱός, and these terms, we believe, he did not understand in a personal sense.

of the Logos? Is it a personal or an impersonal omnipresence? The answer may be obtained from those passages in the *de Engastrimytho* where Origen is taken to task for saying (when he refers to the descent of Christ into Hades) that, although Christ was in Hades, yet προαιρέσει He was above. Eustathius replies that it is not so much προαιρέσει as ἀρετῇ τῆς θεότητος that the Logos is present everywhere.[1] This of itself, of course, is not decisive. It is when we note that for him θεότητος ἀρετῇ is the same as θειότητος ἐνεργείᾳ that his meaning becomes clear.[2] Thus it would seem that Eustathius, who never definitely expresses the *hypostasis* of the Son, and who unflinchingly maintains the μία θεότης, holds that the Logos is but an attribute of the one Divinity, which when put forth becomes the divine ἐνέργεια. Moreover—though in saying this we anticipate what will be said in the next chapter—this verdict is strengthened when attention is paid to his teaching on the Incarnation. He does not say that the personal Logos or Son came down from heaven, and, as an act of divine condescension, took human nature upon Him, but that the Logos goes out (ὁρμώμενος) from heaven, dwelling in the human Jesus, and (at the same time) continues (διαιτώμενος) in the Father's bosom.[3] Is not this then, but the indwelling of the divine ἐνέργεια, and does not this clarify Eustathius' meaning in those passages already quoted where he speaks of the δύναμις in its relation to the manhood of Christ? We can only conclude that he regards the Logos—with which we also include the other terms which he uses synonymously—as the potentiality of God, omnipresent in virtue of its inherent divinity (θεότητος ἀρετῇ), and omnipresent as God's activity (θειότητος ἐνεργείᾳ).

But there may be urged against this view all that Eustathius says concerning the Son and the divine begetting. It will be remembered that he calls the Father "the Divine Parent", and the Son, "true Son", "only begotten", and "God by nature".

[1] *De Eng.* 54, 27 and 55, 1.

[2] Compare *de Eng.* 56, 25: θεότητος ἀρετῇ δηλονότι πάντα πληροῖ πανταχῶς, with *ibid.* 57, 3: θειότητος ἐνεργείᾳ τοῖς ἅπασιν ὡς ἔνι μάλιστα πάντα πληροῖ πανταχῶς. The verbal agreement here shows plainly that by θεότητος ἀρετῇ Eustathius means θειότητος ἐνεργείᾳ.

[3] *P.G.* xviii, 680 D. Quoted below, p. 93, n. 1.

Moreover, he speaks of ἡ ἀληθὴς θεογονία. Then how can it be assumed that Eustathius holds that the Son is not personal? We must understand from the outset that the basis of his doctrinal teaching lies not in the Son in relation to the Father, but in the Logos in relation to God. As a matter of fact he seems to stand at the parting of the ways. The old theology expressed in terms of God and the Logos was gradually coming to an end. Instead there was rising, mainly through the influence of Origen, the more satisfactory theology expressed in terms of the Father and the Son. Eustathius had been trained in the former way of thinking, which had been brought into line with the Syrian tradition with its insistence on the divine unity. With the coming of the newer mode of thought it was but natural for him, as it must have been for others, to equate the Son with the Logos, despite the difficulties that were thereby entailed. Had he lived at a time when this more satisfactory mode of thought was firmly established, he would have been as orthodox as the later Antiochenes.

Then how does he understand the begetting of the Son or the Logos? And what does he mean by ἡ ἀληθὴς θεογονία? Let us remember that he never says the Son is eternal, or that the begetting is eternal. The nearest approach that he makes towards such an assertion is his remark that the Logos ἦν ἀνέκαθεν παρὰ τῷ πατρί.[1] It seems, rather, that Eustathius thinks in terms of the Logos ἐνδιάθετος and προφορικός,[2] and that with the "putting-forth" he understands the begetting of the Logos or the Son. Perhaps he makes the somewhat usual distinction between δύναμις and ἐνέργεια, and regards the potentiality of God, when put forth, as God's activity.[3] Seemingly, like the Apologists, he holds that the Son was begotten for the world's

[1] See above, p. 84.

[2] In this way he is but carrying forward the teaching of Theophilus (Bishop of Antioch *c.* 180). Compare the statement found in the latter's *Apologia ad Autolycum*, ii, 22: ἡ ἀλήθεια διηγεῖται τὸν λόγον τὸν ὄντα διὰ παντὸς ἐνδιάθετον ἐν καρδίᾳ θεοῦ...τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησε προφορικόν.

[3] It is noteworthy that at the Council of Nicaea Constantine is reported to have brought forward the same idea, saying that the Son πρὶν ἐνεργείᾳ γεννηθῆναι, δυνάμει ἦν ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ἀγεννήτως (Eusebius' Letter to his Diocese as found in Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 12). We dare not say, of ourse, that Eustathius was responsible for the Emperor's remark.

creation, for he quotes Wisdom xviii, 14–16,[1] which describes the Logos leaping forth "when peaceful silence enwrapped all things". So we are inclined to think that Eustathius understands γεννᾶν in the sense of ἐξερεύγεσθαι or προβάλλεσθαι. Nor should this be considered an anachronism. Arius, in a letter written shortly before 325,[2] condemns three Syrian Bishops for saying that the Son is an ἐρυγή, and a προβολή, and that He is συναγέννητος, and, since in all probability the Bishops maintained the unity of the Godhead against his teaching, it is almost certain that they understood γεννᾶν in this way. We think it is but reasonable to conclude—especially in view of the primary consideration that according to his teaching the Son has no proper *hypostasis* —that he regards the Son as God's inherent power (*i.e.* as δύναμις which was ἀνέκαθεν παρὰ τῷ πατρί), which was begotten, that is "put forth", for the world's creation (as the divine ἐνέργεια), and which, being by nature God, was then truly begotten.[3] In this way, while maintaining the one Divinity, he can still uphold the duality between God in Himself and God in His activity, thereby preserving the truth of the divine unity.[4]

How, then, must Eustathius have understood the divine τριάς, which, though the remaining fragments do not contain the word, certainly had a place among the doctrinal ideas of the day? A definite answer is almost impossible, yet from hints contained in two fragments we believe it is possible to arrive at the general trend of his thought. We will quote the passages in full. The first runs: "The words 'I am not ascended to My Father' (St John xx, 17) the Logos and God, who comes down from heaven and who continues within the bosom of the Father, does

[1] *De Eng.* 56, 12 ff.

[2] Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 5. See above, pp. 20, 21.

[3] In this way would we interpret such expressions as: ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ θεὸς ὢν ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐξ αὐτοῦ (*P.G.* xviii, 685 C); θεὸς καὶ φύσει θεοῦ γνήσιος υἱός (*de Eng.* 40, 5); δῆλος μέν ἐστι φύσει θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ γεννηθεὶς ὁ χρίσας (688 B); ὁ μὲν γὰρ υἱός, τὰ θεῖα τῆς πατρῴας ἀρετῆς γνωρίσματα φέρων, εἰκὼν ἐστι τοῦ πατρός, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ὅμοιοι ἐξ ὁμοίων γεννώμενοι, εἰκόνες οἱ τικτόμενοι φαίνονται τῶν γεννητόρων ἀληθεῖς (677 D).

[4] In this way we would interpret *de Eng.* 65, 4 and Cav. Frag. 9. Both are quoted above, p. 83, n. 8.

not say, *nor* the *σοφία* which contains all created things".[1] The second passage, after quoting Acts ii, 36, continues: "So He made Jesus who suffered Lord, and not the *σοφία nor* the Logos which has the might of dominion from the beginning".[2] We would infer from these passages that Eustathius was ready to draw a distinction between the Logos and the *σοφία*, though it could be only an abstract distinction, for he must have found that in practice the two were combined in God's activity. He certainly regards *σοφία* as *πνεῦμα*,[3] but he must have regarded it as an aspect of the divine activity. It is true he makes mention of the *πρόσωπον* of the Holy Spirit in the *de Engastrimytho*, but it should be noted particularly that he is quoting Origen's words, and accordingly we find that *ἔφη* is introduced into the text.[4] It is significant, too, that more than once[5] he describes the Holy Spirit as *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, without the article, for the Church had yet to formulate her belief concerning the Third Person of the Trinity. We must not be surprised, therefore, if we find undeveloped thought concerning the Holy Spirit in Eustathius' teaching. Perhaps his ideas of the *τριάς* were somewhat akin to those of a former Bishop of Antioch, Theophilus. In his *Apologia ad Autolycum*, the latter speaks of the *τριάς*, of God, and of His Logos, and of His *σοφία*.[6] It would be wrong to imagine that Theophilus understood the divine *τριάς* from the point of view of later orthodoxy. For him, as for Eustathius, it was in all probability the result of a mental exercise whereby in an abstract way he could distinguish the Logos from the *σοφία*.

Loofs, however, is inclined to see a certain kinship between

[1] *οὐχ ὁ λόγος ἔφασκε καὶ θεὸς ὁ οὐρανόθεν ὁρμώμενος καὶ ἐν τοῖς κόλποις διαιτώμενος τοῦ πατρός, οὐδ' ἡ πάντα τὰ γενητὰ περιέχουσα σοφία*, *P.G.* 18, 680 D (*οὐρανόθεν ὁρμώμενος* is important for a true understanding of Eustathius' Christological teaching).

[2] *τὸν παθόντα τοιγαροῦν Ἰησοῦν κύριον ἐποίησε καὶ οὐ τὴν σοφίαν οὐδὲ τὸν λόγον... P.G.* 18, 681 A.

[3] So he speaks of *τὸ θεῖον τῆς σοφίας πνεῦμα* (*P.G.* xviii, 684 A).

[4] *De Eng.* 25, 25—quoting Origen's *de Eng.* 7, 21 (Jahn's edit.).

[5] *De Eng.* 63, 11, and *P.G.* xviii, 677 B.

[6] *Ad Autol.* ii, 15. The three days before the lights in the firmament were created are *τύποι τῆς τριάδος, τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς σοφίας αὐτοῦ.*

the teaching of Eustathius and that of Marcellus of Ancyra. He believes that Eustathius thought on the lines of an economic Trinity, and held that the δυάς expanded into a τριάς with the outpouring of the Spirit.[1] But it is by no means certain that Loofs is right in making a deduction of this sort. While we do not deny that fundamentally, that is in a common basic view of the essential unity between God and the Logos, the latter being regarded as the creating principle of the one Divine Being, the two are akin,[2] we find it difficult to see a closer kinship between them. Marcellus teaches that the Logos, as Logos, was present with God before the Incarnation, and that it was only at the time of the Incarnation that the Logos became Son. Eustathius, on the other hand, makes no such distinction. For him, the Logos was also the Son before the assumption of the manhood. Moreover, in interpreting Col. i, 15, Marcellus says expressly that the Logos is invisible, and therefore cannot be the image of God. It is the σάρξ, assumed by the Logos, which is that image. Eustathius, on the contrary, interpreting the same passage, holds that the Son, as Son, is the image of God, and that the man whom the Son bore is the image of the Son.[3] No doubt, as Loofs says in his *Nestorius*,[4] both have "the same striking explanation of Proverbs viii, 22", but it was impossible for either of them to interpret the passage in any other way. Neither would we place

[1] Compare his *Paulus von Samosata*, pp. 300, 301. At the same time he is ready to confess that his reasons are not decisive (p. 301).

[2] Thus in Frag. 52 (Klostermann, *Eusebius Werke*, iv, *Gegen Marcell*, where the fragments of Marcellus' writings are collected at the end of the volume) Marcellus says: ἵν' ἐν μὲν τῷ φῆσαι 'ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος' δείξῃ δυνάμει ἐν τῷ πατρὶ εἶναι τὸν λόγον...ἐν δὲ τῷ 'καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν' ἐνεργείᾳ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εἶναι τὸν λόγον. This of course is in full agreement with what we believe to be Eustathius' teaching.

[3] Marcellus asks: πῶς εἰκὼν τοῦ ἀφάτου θεοῦ ὁ λόγος καθ' ἑαυτὸν εἶναι δύναται, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀόρατος ὤν; ἀδύνατον γὰρ τὸ μὴ ὁρατὸν διὰ τοῦ ἀοράτου φανῆναι ποτέ. So he says: ὁπηνίκα τὴν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ γενομένην ἀνείληφεν σάρκα εἰκὼν ἀληθὴς τοῦ ἀοράτου θεοῦ γέγονεν (Klostermann, Frags. 93, 94). On the contrary Eustathius says: ὁ υἱὸς...εἰκών ἐστι τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπειδὴ ὅμοιοι ἐξ ὁμοίων γεννώμενοι, εἰκόνες οἱ τικτόμενοι φαίνονται τῶν γεννητόρων ἀληθεῖς. ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ὃν ἐφόρησεν εἰκών ἐστι τοῦ υἱοῦ (*P.G.* xviii, 677 D).

[4] P. 118, n. 3, where this, and the following arguments, are to be found.

any trust in the fact that both quoted Baruch iii, 36–38. We feel that it is very doubtful whether the Eustathian fragment, which contains the quotation, is genuine, and, even if it is genuine, we call to mind that Hippolytus used the same passage before them and Hilary after them.[1] Certainly in both is found "the same understanding of ὁμοούσιος as excluding persons (ὑποστάσεις) in the Trinity", but this is accounted for by the fact that they have a common basic point of view. For the same reason they were bound to have "the same use of πνεῦμα as applied to Logos".[2]

The teaching of Marcellus, it would seem, was much nearer Sabellianism proper than was that of Eustathius. It is our belief that it was because the latter failed to posit the Son's *hypostasis* that he was condemned as a follower of Sabellius. Marcellus not only failed to posit the *hypostasis* of the Logos, though he gave the Son as Son some sort of personality, but drew directly from the fount of Sabellianism when he spoke of the expansion of the divinity into a τριάς. We have no grounds for asserting that Eustathius did the same, and Loofs has to confess that his arguments, even in their entirety, are not convincing. Eustathius, in the surviving fragments, never speaks of the divine expansion; in fact, so far as we can tell, there is no mention of the τριάς. His is the more old-fashioned theology of the Syrian tradition.[3]

[1] The quotation from Baruch occurs in the supposed Eustathian fragment contained in the *Contestatio* of Eusebius of Dorylaeum. (See above, p. 70.) Cavallera includes it among his fragments (Frag. 82) though adding an anathema which in any case does not belong to Eustathius. Hippolytus used the Baruch passage in his *c. Noetum*, 2 and Hilary in his *de Trinitate* (*P.L.* x, 156).

[2] Thus, because of this "common basic point of view" we do not doubt that Eustathius could have agreed with Marcellus when he said: ἀδύνατον ἦν χωρὶς λόγου καὶ τῆς παρούσης τῷ λόγῳ σοφίας ἐννοῆσαι περὶ τῆς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκευῆς τὸν θεόν (Klostermann, Frag. 59); and ἔχαιρεν γὰρ εἰκότως ὁ πατὴρ μετὰ σοφίας καὶ δυνάμεως διὰ τοῦ λόγου πάντα ποιῶν (Klostermann, Frag. 60). In both statements there may well be an abstract distinction between λόγος and σοφία (=πνεῦμα). But we never find in Eustathius anything like Frag. 67 where Marcellus says the Monad expands into a Triad, the Holy Spirit proceeding ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς παρὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ.

[3] He has much in common with Theophilus of Antioch. He has, we think, the same view of the τριάς and of the begetting of the Logos. Moreover, his teaching is akin to that of Theophilus who regards the

We feel that he regarded the Logos and *σοφία* (= *πνεῦμα*) as aspects of the divine *δύναμις* which in the abstract could be distinguished, and that in the outpouring of the Spirit he could see the work of the omnipresent *ἐνέργεια θειότητος*, viewed primarily from its aspect of *πνεῦμα*. But perhaps, after all, Eustathius laid more emphasis on the *δυάς* than on the *τριάς*, for it cannot be said that as yet the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was fully established.

But if the teaching of Eustathius is not akin to that of Marcellus of Ancyra, it is certainly akin to that of Paul of Samosata. As we shall try to show, Eustathius, in his teaching concerning God, has a definite place in the Syrian tradition, and it seems to us that, apart from a clear understanding of that place, his teaching cannot be explained satisfactorily. We shall see that he stands between Paul, who upheld the uni-personality of the Godhead, and Flavian and Diodore and Theodore of Mopsuestia, who thought in terms of a triune-personality.

First of all, let us mark the affinity between the teaching of Paul and that of Eustathius. As we have seen already,[1] Paul holds that the Logos is not a personal Being, but merely a quality of the one divine Personality. He confesses that the Logos is *ἐνεργός*, and with it he associates the *σοφία*.[2] In fact he uses *λόγος* and *σοφία* as synonymous terms,[3] and the same is to be said of his use of *λόγος* and *υἱός*.[4] He maintains that the Logos was begotten[5] (for the purpose of creation), and, if we may trust

Logos as *πνεῦμα*, *σοφία*, and *δύναμις ὕψιστον*. See the latter's *ad Autol.* ii, 10.

[1] See the summary of Paul's teaching put out above, pp. 8, 9 (with notes).

[2] Compare Athanasius *c. Apollinar.* ii, 3 (*P.G.* xxvi, 1136): *λόγον ἐνεργὸν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ σοφίαν ἐν αὐτῷ...ἵνα εἷς εἴη ὁ ἐπι πάντα θεὸς ὁ πατήρ*. It is noteworthy that the concluding expression (derived from Rom. ix, 5) is found in Eustathius (*P.G.* xviii, 681 D).

[3] See, for example, the fragment reconstructed by Lawlor (*J.T.S.* vol. xix, No. 73, p. 22) where it is quite clear that *λόγος* and *σοφία* are used in this way. He must have regarded *σοφία* as an aspect of the *λόγος ἐνεργός*. Seemingly, Eustathius took a similar view (p. 93).

[4] Compare (Loofs, *Paulus von Samosata*, p. 338) Frag. 2 (*πρόσωπον ἓν τὸν θεὸν ἅμα τῷ λόγῳ*) with Frag. 5 (*ὁ πατὴρ ἅμα τῷ υἱῷ εἷς θεός*).

[5] See above, p. 8, n. 4.

the opinions of others, he regards the Logos when begotten as *προφορικός*.[1] For him the Holy Spirit is but the grace which companied with the disciples.[2] Now when this teaching is compared with that of Eustathius, it will be seen that the latter is intimately connected with the former. Both have the same view of God as the unipersonal Being; both regard the Logos as divine activity, and understand the begetting in the sense of "being put forth"; both treat *λόγος* and *σοφία* as synonymous terms. Yet Paul's is the cruder presentation of the principles of the Syrian tradition.

We say this because we feel that the teaching of Eustathius contains within itself the plant of the new theological outlook which expressed itself in terms of Father and Son. In his teaching that plant seems to be struggling for existence; in that of the later Antiochenes it is bearing fruit. The latter had broken loose from the fetters of the old conception of God and the Logos, where the Logos was but the active principle of the one Divinity, and instead strove to express their beliefs in terms of the Divine Sonship, thereby introducing the truth of the Son's personal existence. Perhaps the teaching of Meletius[3] would have illustrated the truth of our assertions, but unfortunately no evidence of it has reached us. It is clear, however, that with Flavian and Diodore the new line of thought is well-founded. Interpreting '*ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*' Flavian declared that the Logos was God eternally,[4] and Diodore took in hand to refute those of a former generation who held that the Logos had no *hypostasis*.[5] But it is

[1] *λόγον προφορικὸν αὐτὸν σχηματίσας* (so Epiphanius, in Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 37). So also Marius Mercator: *Nestorius circa Verbum Dei non ut Paulus sentit, qui non substantivum sed prolatitium* (*προφορικόν*) *potentiae Dei efficax Verbum esse definit* (*D.C.B.* iv, 253). See also the quotation from Marius in Lawlor (*l.c.* p. 37).

[2] So Leontius, *de Sectis*, iii, 3: *πνεῦμα δὲ τὴν ἐπιφοιτήσασαν χάριν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις.*

[3] Bishop of Antioch *c.* 360.

[4] Compare the fragment found in Theodoret, *Dialogue*, i (*P.G.* lxxxiii, 77 B): *οὐκ εἰς σάρκα μεταβέβληται οὐδὲ ἀπέστη τοῦ εἶναι θεός, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο ἦν ἀϊδίως....*

[5] Theodoret, in *Haeret. Fab.* ii, 11, says he wrote against Paul, Sabellius, Marcellus, and Photinus—*κατὰ τῶν τεσσάρων τούτων συνέγραψεν ὁ θεῖος Διόδωρος ὁ τὴν Κιλίκων ἰθύνας μητρόπολιν, θεὸν προαιώνιον τὸν χριστὸν ἀποδείξας, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα.*

to Theodore of Mopsuestia that we must look if we would see the one who, above all others, carried forward the doctrinal teaching of Eustathius. Like Eustathius he insists on the omnipresence of the Divine (we shall see in the next chapter that this formed the foundation of his Christological teaching), but at the same time he pleads the truth of the divine Persons.[1] It is significant that like Diodore, in maintaining the Son's *hypostasis*, he points out the errors of a former generation.[2] It is clear that they had come to the new light, and that in that light they looked back and saw the mistakes of their predecessors. Eustathius, it seems, stands at the beginning of a new era in the Syrian tradition. While his thought is an advance upon the thought of Paul of Samosata, it is not so developed as that of the later Antiochenes.

Eusebius of Caesarea, then, was to a certain extent in the right when he denounced Eustathius as an introducer of the heresy of Sabellius. While we would not assert that he followed Sabellius in his doctrine of the divine expansion, we believe that he maintained the uni-personality of the Divinity, which was the fundamental principle of the Sabellian system. But even if Eustathius, in his insistence on the μία θεότης, failed to uphold the personality of the Son, we are firmly convinced that in his own day he stood nearer the truth than Eusebius of Caesarea and the members of the Eusebian party. They indeed posited the personal Sonship, but after all it was a degraded Sonship. Under their doctrinal system Christianity could have had no real future, inasmuch as they did not fear to say that their Lord was not true God. Rather was it essential for the well-being of the Christian gospel to maintain the divine unity between the Father and the Son, even if it was found difficult to express the truth of the Son's personality in clear terms. The Council of Nicaea was right in

[1] Compare Creed of Theodore in Swete, *Theod. Mops. on the Minor Epistles of St Paul*, ii, 327. Yet it is true that the doctrine of the Trinity, despite Theodore's insistence on it, has no real foundation in his system, for it becomes "an abstract and unproductive thing as soon as we deny that the Logos became man" (Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Eng. tr. ii, 1, p. 49).

[2] Theodore condemns Paul of Samosata, Theodotus and Artemon because they did not hold to the eternal existence of the Son "in propria substantia" (Swete, *l.c.* ii, 318).

establishing ὁμοούσιος even if more than one leading Bishop understood the term in a Sabellianising sense. Eustathius, we would think, was one of them. From this point of view he may be condemned. Nevertheless, in valiantly defending the truth of the unity of the Godhead, we believe that he served the will of God in his own generation.

CHAPTER VI

EUSTATHIUS' CHRISTOLOGY

Eustathius' teaching concerning God has led us to infer that for him, despite the expressions he used, the Logos or the Son is but the impersonal activity of the one Divinity. This, of course, has direct bearing upon his Christological teaching, in which he maintains that the Logos dwelt in the human Jesus. To express the mode of indwelling, Eustathius often uses *κατοικεῖν*. So he speaks of *ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῷ θεός*,[1] and *ἡ τοῦ κατοικοῦντος ἐν αὐτῷ θεότης*.[2] Another favourite word is *φορεῖν*. So he can say, *τὸ ἀνθρώπινον ὄργανον ἀναλαβὼν ἐφόρησε* (*ὁ λόγος*),[3] and can refer to *τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν ἰδέαν ἣν ὁ θεὸς ἐφόρεσε καὶ λόγος*.[4] If we understand him aright he never says that the man bore the Logos.[5] Sometimes he uses *περιβάλλεσθαι*, and speaks of *ὁ κύριος περιβαλλόμενος τὸ σῶμα*.[6] In one place he says: *totum hominem indutus est Deus*.[7] Once he uses *διαιτᾶσθαι*, and says that the divine spirit of wisdom *καὶ τοῦ σώματος εἴσω διῃτᾶτο*.[8] Twice he uses *ἐπιφοιτᾶν*, saying that Christ *ἐπεφοίτα σωματικῶς*, and that the Logos *τὸν ἄνθρωπον ναουργήσας ἐφόρεσεν...σώματι μὲν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐπιφοιτῶν*.[9] Once he describes the indwelling in terms of "anointing", and draws the distinction between *ὁ χρίσας* and *ὁ χρισθείς*.[10]

[1] *P.G.* xviii, 688 A.

[2] *P.G.* xviii, 688 B. Compare also *P.G.* xviii, 677 B, 685 B, and the last fragment but one on p. 693.

[3] *P.G.* xviii, 680 C.

[4] *De Eng.* 55, 28. Compare also *P.G.* xviii, 677 A, C, D.

[5] In two Latin fragments preserved by Gelasius we have *Deifer homo* and *Homo Deum ferens* ("man bearing God") [*P.G.* xviii, 693, 6th and 7th Frags. on the page]. We think that these expressions are due to a misreading of *θεοφορος*. In all probability *θεόφορος* ("borne by God") stood in the original, and this was translated as *θεοφόρος* ("bearing God").

[6] *De Eng.* 63, 16.

[7] *P.G.* xviii, 693 (5th on page).

[8] *P.G.* xviii, 684 A.

[9] *De Eng.* 56, 3 and *P.G.* xviii, 677 C.

[10] *P.G.* xviii, 688 B.

The terms he uses to express the divine in Christ are *ὁ λόγος*,[1] *ὁ λόγος καὶ θεός*,[2] *ὁ θεὸς καὶ λόγος*,[3] *ὁ υἱός*,[4] *τὸ θεῖον* (or *θειότατον*) *πνεῦμα*,[5] *τὸ θεῖον τῆς σοφίας πνεῦμα*,[6] and *ἡ ἀνωτάτω σοφία*.[7] By these terms we would understand that in reality Eustathius means God in His activity. Inasmuch, then, as the activity of God cannot be separated from Himself, he can use other terms, which strictly speaking apply to the Divine Being. So he says that *ὁ θεός*,[8] *τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος*,[9] and *ἡ οὐσία*[10] dwelt in the manhood assumed.

This manhood he most frequently describes as *ὁ ἄνθρωπος*.[11] So he speaks of "the Man who was crucified",[12] "the Man who died",[13] and "the Man who was compacted of various limbs".[14] Several times he uses *ἄνθρωπος* (without the article).[15] He also employs the kindred terms *ἀνθρώπειος* and *ἀνθρώπινος*, referring to the soul "of this human tabernacle",[16] and "the human organ" which came forth from Mary.[17] Again, two favourite terms are

[1] In addition to the references made in the previous paragraph we may note here *P.G.* xviii, 677 A and 693 (1st on page).

[2] *P.G.* xviii, 689 D, 677 A, 685 C, 688 D, 692 C, 696 (2nd on page), and *de Eng.* 56, 17.

[3] *De Eng.* 55, 7; 55, 25; 55, 29.

[4] *P.G.* xviii, 677 D, and *de Eng.* 40, 4.

[5] *P.G.* xviii, 681 C, 681 D, 685 B, 689 B and 692 C (*divinus spiritus*).

[6] *P.G.* xviii, 684 A.

[7] *P.G.* xviii, 681 D, 684 B.

[8] *P.G.* xviii, 677 B, 685 B, 688 B and 693 (5th and 9th on page).

[9] *P.G.* xviii, 681 D. See also his use of *ἡ θεότης* in 688 B.

[10] *P.G.* xviii, 684 C. We can infer from this that Eustathius regards the indwelling as *κατ' οὐσίαν*. Compare with this the teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia, who, in making the distinction between *κατ' οὐσίαν* (and *κατ' ἐνέργειαν*) and *κατ' εὐδοκίαν* carries the thought a stage further. See below, p. 117. See also (on *κατ' ἐνέργειαν*), p. 104.

[11] He uses *ὁ ἄνθρωπος* at least 13 times in the surviving fragments; *homo* is found 12 times in the Latin fragments.

[12] *P.G.* xviii, 681 A.

[13] *P.G.* xviii, 680 C.

[14] *P.G.* xviii, 680 D.

[15] *De Eng.* 40, 5; 54, 10, and *P.G.* xviii, 677 B.

[16] *De Eng.* 55, 3: *τοῦδε τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου σκηνώματος*. Compare also *ibid.* 55. 21 (*τὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου γένους ὁρμώμενον*), and *ibid.* 55, 28 (*τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν ἰδέαν ἣν ὁ θεὸς ἐφόρεσε καὶ λόγος*).

[17] *P.G.* xviii, 680 C: *ἐκ τῆς παρθένου τὸ ἀνθρώπινον ὄργανον ἀναλαβὼν ἐφόρεσεν*.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL

ναός[1] and *σκηνή*.[2] So he says that the Logos bore the temple and dwelt therein;[3] it was the very own chosen temple of the Logos;[4] it was beautiful, holy, undefiled and spotless;[5] it was nailed to the Cross and suffered;[6] it was raised (as is to be inferred from the Scriptures) by the Father and the Son.[7] In the same way he regards the manhood as the very own *οἶκος* of the Logos.[8] Another term is *τὸ σῶμα*. So he can speak of "the Lord clothed with a body",[9] and can say that "the Logos companied with men in a body",[10] describing it as the very own body of the Logos.[11]

Having thus summarised his Christological terms, we arrive at the opening question: Does Eustathius posit a true incarnation? Before we can answer the question satisfactorily we must enter more fully into a consideration of his teaching concerning the

[1] In addition to the references made below, see, for instances of his use of *ναός*: *P.G.* xviii, 677 B (*τὴν λύσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν...τοῦ νεώ*), 684 B (where he says that the *σοφία* "confirms both what is within and what is without the temple"), 693 (8th on page) and 696 (2nd on page). The last two references are to the Latin fragments, where Eustathius mentions the *Verbi templum*. [There are at least 13 instances of his use of *ναός*, and *templum* is to be found 5 times in the Latin fragments.]

[2] *P.G.* xviii, 677 B, 688 D. Compare also *de Eng.* 55, 3 (quoted above, p. 101, n. 16).

[3] *P.G.* xviii, 677 C.

[4] So it is *ὁ ἔκκριτος ἑαυτοῦ ναός* (*de Eng.* 55, 2). The Son promises to raise *τὸν ἴδιον ναόν* (*P.G.* xviii, 681 C). The Logos and God raised *τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ναόν* (685 C). The Logos and God raised *suum templum* on the third day (696, 2nd on page). Compare also *ἐκκρίτῳ ναουργίᾳ κοσμηθείς* (688 B). Hence we infer that Eustathius' principal Christological thought is that the Logos has assumed the manhood. Note the similar expressions when he speaks of the *οἶκος* and the *σῶμα*.

[5] *ναοῦ χρῆμα περικαλλές, ἀφιερωμένον, ἀσύλητον* (*de Eng.* 40, 6). Compare also *P.G.* xviii, 677 B: *ναὸς γὰρ κυρίως ὁ καθαρὸς καὶ ἄχραντος, ἡ κατὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπόν ἐστι περὶ τὸν λόγον σκηνή*, and 694 (1st on page): *homo ex membris justitiae templum decenter factus*, and 696 (2nd on page): *aedificavit templum praecipua pulchritudine Deus*.

[6] *P.G.* xviii, 684 C.

[7] *P.G.* xviii, 681 C.

[8] *P.G.* xviii, 681 C: *αὐτὸς* (*i.e.* ? *ὁ υἱός*) *δι' ἑαυτοῦ τὸν ἴδιον ἀνεστήσατο νεουργήσας οἶκον*.

[9] *De Eng.* 63, 16. (Quoted above, p. 100.)

[10] *P.G.* xviii, 677 C.

[11] *τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα* (*P.G.* xviii, 680 A, 689 A). For other references to *τὸ σῶμα* see *P.G.* xviii, 684 A, and *de Eng.* 56, 6.

divine omnipresence. While he holds that the Logos or the Son was present within the human tabernacle, he also maintains that it was present without that tabernacle. They are ungodly, he says, who thoughtlessly consider that the Divine is circumscribed by a place or by any defined part of a place, for the Son, while continuing in the Father's bosom, sojourned on earth and as God was present everywhere.[1] Perhaps the best illustration of his thought is to be found in a fragment from the *Homily on Proverbs viii*, 22. We will quote the passage in full:

For when the body was crucified on high the divine spirit of wisdom (*τὸ θεῖον τῆς σοφίας πνεῦμα*) dwelt even within the body, trod in heavenly places, filled all the earth, reigned over the depths, visited and judged the soul of every man, and continued to do everything that God continually does, for the wisdom that is on high (*ἡ ἀνωτάτω σοφία*) is not imprisoned and contained within bodily matter, just as moist and dry materials are contained within their vessels, and are contained by but do not contain them. But being a divine and ineffable power, it embraces and confirms both what is within and what is without the temple, and thence proceeding beyond, it comprehends and sways all matter.[2]

Now we can attempt to answer the question. A true incarnation implies that the personal Son of God came down from heaven, and took man's nature upon Him, making human experiences His own, that He might effect man's salvation. In virtue of His inherent divinity it would be true to say that His becoming man did not limit the powers which belonged to Him as God, so that, while He was present in the body He assumed, He was present everywhere, functioning as befitted His divinity. Both Athanasius and Gregory of Nyssa are prepared to uphold the Son's omnipresence from this point of view.[3] But Eustathius does not think on these lines. For him, as we believe, the Logos or the Son is not a personal being, but merely the *ἐνέργεια θειότητος*, and as such is omnipresent, its dwelling in the Man not limiting its

[1] *De Eng.* 56, 25 ff., 56, 7.

[2] *P.G.* xviii, 684 A, B. Compare the similar thought of Paul of Samosata: *ὁ φαινόμενος οὐκ ἦν σοφία, οὐ γὰρ ἠδύνατο ἐν σχήματι εὑρίσκεσθαι, οὐδὲ ἐν θέᾳ ἀνδρός· μείζων γὰρ τῶν ὁρωμένων ἐστίν* (Loofs, *Paulus von Samosata*, p. 337; Lawlor, *Sayings of Paul of Samosata*, p. 22).

[3] See above, p. 86.

power (inasmuch as it is divine) to be everywhere else at the same time. So he can say (in respect of the earthly life of Christ) that the Logos "goeth out from heaven (*οὐρανόθεν ὁρμώμενος*) and continueth (*διαιτώμενος*) in the Father's bosom".[1] He does not say, it should be noted, that the Logos "came down" (*ὁρμηθείς*) from heaven as an act of divine condescension, neither does he say that the Logos became man. Instead, he says that the Logos "bore", "dwelt in", "was clothed with", "companied with", and "anointed" the Man, and that "thence proceeding beyond it (in this case, *ἡ ἀνώτατω σοφία*) comprehends and sways all matter". So we must assume that he regards the divine indwelling (*ἐνοίκησις*) in Christ as *κατ' ἐνέργειαν*. Moreover, as we have pointed out already, he uses the term *οὐσία* to describe the divine in Christ.[2] His mode of thought can be easily understood, for he must have seen that God's essence cannot be separated from these attributes which belong to that essence. It follows, therefore, that he regards the indwelling as *κατ' ἐνέργειαν* in relation to God in His activity, and as *κατ' οὐσίαν* in relation to God in Himself. But the incarnation of the personal Son of God he altogether fails to posit. All he teaches is the divine indwelling of the impersonal Logos which, "while it touched the heaven, trod upon the earth at the same time".[3]

From this point of view the Christological teaching of Eustathius is unsatisfactory. Its worth, rather, lies in its insistence on the truth of the Lord's complete manhood. A quotation from his *contra Arianos* epitomises the writer's standpoint: "Not in appearance or supposition, but in very reality God was clothed with a whole man, assuming him perfectly".[4] For Eustathius, Jesus is truly man, consisting of body and soul.[5] His soul (*ψυχή*) is

[1] *P.G.* xviii, 680 D.

[2] *P.G.* xviii, 684 C.

[3] *De Eng.* 56, 24, where after quoting Wisdom xviii, 14–16, he repeats *v.* 16 *b*, adding, significantly, *ἐν ταὐτῷ*. Compare Dorner's verdict (though seemingly he thinks that Eustathius regards the Logos as personal): "The utmost he arrives at is an action of the Logos in and on this man; an incarnation, an humanification of the Logos, lay beyond his reach" (*Person of Christ*, Eng. tr. I, ii, p. 522).

[4] *P.G.* xviii, 694 (5th on page): *non phantastice et putative, sed ipsa veritate totum hominem indutus est Deus.*

[5] *P.G.* xviii, 694 (5th on page): *homini . . . qui ex anima constat et corpore.*

ὁμοούσιος with the souls of men, and his flesh (σάρξ) is ὁμοούσιος with the flesh of men.[1] So he maintains that Jesus experienced a true human development, both from a physical and from a moral point of view. He was born at Bethlehem, he says, and was wrapped in swaddling clothes. For some time he was brought up in Egypt on account of the determination of the cruel Herod, and grew to man's estate at Nazareth.[2] When a child of eight days old he was circumcised according to the Law, and afterwards his parents brought him to the Temple, and made the customary offerings of purification.[3] As the Evangelist says particularly, he increased in wisdom and stature and grace.[4]

But while Eustathius maintains the full physical development of the human Jesus, it is also clear that he maintains his full moral development, taking, as it seems, a dichotomist view of man's being.[5] A true understanding of what he means by the human soul is to be gained from the surviving fragments of his *de Anima contra Philosophos*[6] and from what he says elsewhere.[7] Against the philosophical schools he maintains that the soul does not pre-exist, but that it increases with the body.[8] In this way he seems to hold that it exists as the seat of sense-perceptions in the body,[9] and that, living and surviving apart from the

[1] *P.G.* xviii, 685 D. [2] *P.G.* xviii, 688 D. [3] *P.G.* xviii, 680 B.

[4] *P.G.* xviii, 694 (3rd on page), quoting St Luke ii, 52.

[5] Compare the quotation above, p. 104, n. 5. In the same way, writing of Samuel in the *de Eng.* (29, 16) he says: *ὁ γὰρ ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἡρμοσμένος οὗτός ἐστι Σαμουήλ, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ κρᾶσιν ἔχων ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἀνάλογον.* It seems quite likely that in taking this dichotomist view he had been influenced by the later Greek philosophers.

[6] Cav. Frags. 46, 47, 48; *P.G.* lxxxvi, 2037–2040.

[7] Especially his teaching concerning the presence of the human soul of Christ in Hades. See *de Eng.* §§ 17, 18, and the fragment preserved by Eustathius, *P.G.* xviii, 689 CD.

[8] *δῆλον ὅτι συναυξάνει μὲν τῷ σώματι, καθάπερ δὲ τοῦτο λεληθότως ὑπαναλέγεται τὰς δυνάμεις, οὕτω καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ προκόπτουσα τὸν νοῦν* (Cav. Frag. 47). It seems that Eustathius regards *νοῦς* as the highest expression of the *ψυχή*.

[9] Compare Cav. Frag. 47 where he is proving that souls are not set up unbegotten: *εἰ δὲ λείπεται (τὰ παιδία) νοῦ καὶ λόγου καὶ συνέσεως, οὐκ ἄρα καθέστηκαν ἀγέννητοι τὴν φύσιν αἱ ψυχαί. σύμπαντες οὖν ἴσμεν ὅτι τοῖς τῶν σωμάτων ὄγκοις ἡ ψυχὴ συνεκτέταται διαρκῶς, οὐ μεγέθει μόνον ἢ βραχύτητι μελῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις τῆς γνώμης ἀναλογίαις.* Compare

body,[1] its own inherent quality is preserved.[2] In this light let us note how he regards the soul of the human Jesus. It is *ὁμοούσιος* with the souls of men, he says.[3] So we understand him to mean that it functions as the centre of his human being. It is *λογική*, he says.[3] So we understand him to mean that it possessed, among other attributes, a power of choice.[4] It is *ἁγία*, he says.[5] So we understand him to mean that its own inherent quality was one of holiness.

Now if we judge his teaching aright, Eustathius does not regard the Man as a personality apart from the Logos, but as the very own temple[6] in which the Logos dwelt continually.[7] The human, it would seem, according to his thought, developed alongside of, rather than apart from, the divine, the divine being present with the human strengthening it. So, in describing the relationship between the Logos and the soul, he says on the one hand that the soul dwelt together (*συνδιαιτωμένη*) authoritatively with the Logos and God,[8] and on the other hand that the Logos was present

also the end of Cav. Frag. 48: *ὡς δὲ εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ* (*i.e.* *τοῦ πρωτοπλάστου*) *δημιουργικῶς ἐνεφύσησεν ὁ θεός, αὐτίκα τὴν κίνησιν εἴληφε· ἐξ ἐκείνου δὲ βαδίζει καὶ ἀναπνεῖ καὶ φθέγγεται, ἄρχει λογίζεται πράττει διοικεῖ.*

[1] *P.G.* xviii, 685 D: *ἀλλὰ μὴν ἡ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* (*ψυχὴ*) *ἑκατέρων πεῖραν ἔσχε. γέγονε γὰρ καὶ ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ψυχῶν, καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐκτὸς γενομένη ζῇ καὶ ὑφέστηκε.*

[2] That Eustathius teaches that the soul possesses its own inherent quality may be seen from the following (Cav. Frag. 47): *ὅσοι δὲ μηδέποτε βαίνουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄμεινον, ἀλλὰ μωροὶ διαμένουσιν, δῆλον ὅτι λελωβημένου τινὸς μορίου ἀτελεῖς ἔχουσι τὰς ψυχάς, ὥσπερ οἱ τὴν φρενίτιδα ἀρρωστήσαντες νόσον.*

[3] *P.G.* xviii, 685 D (continuation of above): *λογικὴ ἄρα καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὁμοούσιος, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ σὰρξ ὁμοούσιος τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων σαρκὶ τυγχάνει, ἐκ τῆς Μαρίας προελθοῦσα.*

[4] The fragment (Cav. Frag. 52) preserved by Maximus Confessor (*P.G.* xci, 277), if genuine, will help to illustrate this point: *θέλησίς ἐστι φυσικὴ λόγου τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν κίνησις· θέλησίς ἐστι ὄρεξις λογική τε καὶ ζωτική.* The fragment purports to come from the *de Anima*.

[5] *De Eng.* 55. 25.

[6] See the notes on *ναός*, *οἶκος*, and *σῶμα*, above p. 102.

[7] So he can say that the manhood is *σύνθρονος τῷ θειοτάτῳ πνεύματι διὰ τὸν οἰκοῦντα θεὸν ἐν αὐτῷ διηνεκῶς* (*P.G.* xviii, 685 B).

[8] *P.G.* xviii, 689 D: *συνδιαιτωμένη κυρίως ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ χριστοῦ τῷ λόγῳ καὶ θεῷ.*

together (*συνουσία*) with the soul.[1] In other words Eustathius seems to think that the relationship was one of reciprocal presence, the soul dwelling with the Logos, and the Logos being present with the soul. It was in such a relationship, then, that the human soul functioned according to its nature. In the body it formed the centre of the Man's being; apart from the body it lived and survived; in both states of existence it dwelt together with the Logos.

Like all other human souls it progressed within the body, and was in possession of a power of choice. So Eustathius can say that the words "I am not yet ascended to My Father" were spoken by the Man, who, not yet having ascended to the Father after the death, "was reserving for Himself the first-fruits of his progress",[2] and, in another place, that the Man whom God bore "of His own free-will (*sponte*) thought good to endure the passion of death for man's good".[3] We must infer from such passages as these that, according to his teaching, the human soul in its progress always willed what was in harmony with the Logos, and therefore dwelt with that divine Spirit. At the same time it seems that Eustathius believes that the Logos itself exercised its influence over the human soul, thereby strengthening it.[4]

In true accordance with his teaching concerning the soul, Eustathius says that the soul of Jesus, while the body was still enveloped in the tomb, went down into Hades.[5] There, possessing all-surveying authority, it flung wide the gates with mighty force, and brought up the souls which were in prison.[6] It could do this, he says, because of the co-presence (*συνουσία*) of the Logos, for the Logos is omnipresent.[7] So the soul redeemed souls of

[1] *De Eng.* 55, 6 ff.: *ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ...θεσπεσίᾳ κεκραταίωται δυνάμει διὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ λόγου συνουσίαν, ὥστε καὶ παντέφορον ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν.*

[2] *P.G.* xviii, 680 D: *ταμιευόμενος δὲ αὐτῷ τῆς προόδου τὴν ἀπαρχήν.*

[3] *P.G.* xviii, 693 (7th frag. on page). Quoted below, p. 108, n. 14.

[4] Compare *de Eng.* 55, 6 and *P.G.* xviii, 684 B. The holy soul is "confirmed" (*κεκραταίωται*) by divine power; the divine and ineffable power "confirms" (*κραταιοῖ*) both what is within and what is without the temple.

[5] *P.G.* xviii, 689 D.

[6] *De Eng.* 55, 3 ff. Compare *P.G.* xviii, 692 A.

[7] *De Eng.* 55, 7.

like nature, and that very day, according to promise, the soul of the penitent thief was led into Paradise.[1] Moreover, in virtue of the soul, the Man has ascended into heaven itself μονώτατος ἐκ πάντων;[2] Jesus who suffered is made Lord of Glory;[3] now is he σύνθρονος with the divine Spirit.[4] At the time of the crucifixion he was without form or comeliness, as Isaiah says, but now is he changed and clothed with beauty.[5] It is not the same tabernacle (ναός) of the Logos and God whereby the blessed Stephen beheld the divine glory.[6] To him is given the judgment of all men,[7] and to him belongs the sovereignty of all things.[8] Now has the Man received a glory which in no wise he possessed before.[9] He himself is *princeps in omnibus*.[10]

Then does Eustathius think that this exaltation is the reward of a holy life? He certainly holds that these glories were "acquired". Thus he says: "The Father does not receive an acquired glory (δόξαν ἐπίκτητον), being perfect, infinite, incomprehensible...neither does the Logos, being God begotten of Him...but the Man of Christ (ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ χριστοῦ) is exalted and glorified";[11] "He who was anointed received an acquired virtue (ἐπίκτητον ἀρετήν)";[12] "He receives the greatest acquired virtues (*accidentes virtutes*), proceeding by dignity (*dignitate*) to a better state".[13] It would seem to be true, then, that to some extent Eustathius thinks that the Man acquired these glories through merit. In fact he says in one passage that the Man whom God bore received the prize of the struggle, even honour and power, a glory which in no wise he possessed before.[14]

[1] *P.G.* xviii, 689 D ff., and *de Eng.* 55, 9–17.
[2] *De Eng.* 55, 22, 24.
[3] *P.G.* xviii, 681 A.
[4] *P.G.* xviii, 685 B.
[5] *P.G.* xviii, 688 A.
[6] *P.G.* xviii, 688 D.
[7] *P.G.* xviii, 693 (3rd and 4th on page).
[8] *P.G.* xviii, 693 (3rd on page).
[9] *P.G.* xviii, 693 (7th on page). Quoted below, n. 14.
[10] *P.G.* xviii, 696 (2nd on page).
[11] *P.G.* xviii, 685 C.
[12] *P.G.* xviii, 688 B.
[13] *P.G.* xviii, 693 (last on page).
[14] *P.G.* xviii, 693 (7th on page): *Homo autem Deum ferens* (? "hominem Deus ferens", see above, p. 100, n. 5), *qui mortis passionem sponte censuit sustinere propter hominum utilitatem, palmam quidem et certaminis, ut ita dicendum sit, honorem, et potestatem percepit. Et ubi recipitur gloria, quam nequaquam prius habuerat.*

But there is no crude Adoptionism in his Christological outlook.[1] It is altogether likely that he looks upon the progress as taking place in the Man while the relationship of reciprocal presence was still being maintained. When, however, he views the Man apart from the Logos—as he is accustomed to do—he is compelled to arrive at the conclusion that the exaltation can be expressed as the reward of the progress of the human soul, and to attribute the acquired virtues to a holy life, lived in complete harmony with the Logos.

This brings us to Eustathius' teaching concerning the Person of Christ, and at the outset we must be on our guard lest we are influenced by the thought of the later Christological controversies. He lived almost a century before the Church's theologians were face to face with problems concerning the two natures and the one Person in Christ. So while we shall find later in the chapter that his Christological principles are the same as those of the later Antiochenes, we must first view his teaching in its own light. Now Eustathius speaks of the "Person of Christ", using the term *πρόσωπον*. This, we believe, he always associates with "Christ". It is true that in one of the Latin fragments preserved by Facundus we find *persona hominis*, but we hesitate to accept it as the translation of an original expression which would be "the person of the Man", for Facundus is not altogether reliable.[2] In the *de Engastrimytho*

[1] Seemingly he teaches that the assumption of the Man on the part of the Logos took place at the time of his formation in the womb. (Compare *P.G.* xviii, 677 A, where he implies that the Logos passing through the Virgin's womb bore the bodily frame.) In fact he holds that the Man was predestined to be the Man of Christ. (See the second of the three Syriac fragments quoted above, p. 74, n.)

[2] *P.G.* xviii, 692 C. After quoting St Mat. xi, 27 the fragment, according to Facundus' translation, continues: *Manifeste ex persona hominis prophetare cognoscitur*. It is quite likely that *ὁ ἄνθρωπος* stood in the original, and that Facundus, desiring to show that Theodore of Mopsuestia was but upholding the teaching of his predecessors, read into it more than is warrantable. The previous fragment (*l.c.*) again is doubtful as it stands, for its use of *persona* is not Eustathian: "*Dum sederit*" *ait* "*Filius hominis in sede majestatis suae*", *alia quidem videtur loqui persona; de altera autem facit manifeste sermonem*. Perhaps the original contained *ὁ ἄλλος* and *ὁ ἕτερος*, Facundus using *persona* to translate the former. It is clear that he has given us a wrong impression of the original form of the fragments.

there are three instances of his use of *πρόσωπον*, and in each case it refers to "Christ". In the first[1], Eustathius says it can be shown *ἐπὶ τοῦ κρείττονος προσώπου* that the power to send for souls out of Hades is greater than the power of the demon who professed to know that the kingship over Israel was to be given to David, and at once continues with an account of the demons, who, "confounded by Christ", acknowledged His divine authority. In the second instance[2] he says that Origen betakes himself *ἐπὶ τὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ πρόσωπον* in his argument, but does not proceed to inquire into His (*αὐτοῦ*, *i.e.* Christ's) divine nature. The third instance[3] is of some importance, for in it we have what almost amounts to his definition of the "Person of Christ". The passage runs (he is writing of our Lord's Temptation): "The devil gazing into the Person of Christ (*τὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ πρόσωπον*) saw within God in fact and operation, and true Son of God by nature, beholding Him clothed without with a Man, holy, undefiled and spotless, even a most beautiful temple, consecrated, inviolate".

Then what does Eustathius mean by the "Person of Christ"? It seems that "Christ" is the name he uses when he is thinking of the union of the divine and human natures.[4] So he speaks of *ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ χριστοῦ* (*homo Christi*)[5] when referring to His human nature, and of *τὸ θεῖον τοῦ χριστοῦ πνεῦμα*[6] when referring to His divine nature. So also he speaks of *ἡ ἁγία τοῦ χριστοῦ ψυχή*.[7] Clearly, he holds that the divine and human natures come together in "Christ". But wherein, according to his teaching, lies the personality of Christ, and what is the mode of the union of the two natures?

In answering the first question we pave the way for an answer to the second. It has been said already that for Eustathius the

[1] *De Eng.* 63, 4. [2] *De Eng.* 54, 1, 11.

[3] *Ibid.* 40. 2.

[4] Eustathius uses *φύσις* in respect of the divine nature (*de Eng.* 54, 11; mentioned above), and in respect of the human nature (*ibid.* 56, 26).

[5] *P.G.* xviii, 685 C, 693 (2nd and 3rd on page). See also (for use of same expression in Syriac fragments) above, p. 74, n.

[6] *P.G.* xviii, 681 C.

[7] *De Eng.* 55, 25. Compare also *P.G.* xviii, 689 D (*ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ χριστοῦ*).

divine in Christ was not the personal Son of God, but merely God in His activity. We can only infer, therefore, that he must have thought that the personality lay in the Man, and that in the Man's human soul.[1] It follows from this that he could arrive at no true ἕνωσις of the two natures, where human and divine are united under the divine personality of the Son of God. Instead, all he can teach is a mere conjunction (*συνάφεια*) of the divine and the human in the person of Christ, where the two natures are joined together because the human soul always wills what is in harmony with the divine. It can be nothing more than a moral union of the Man with the impersonal Logos which proceeds from the one Divinity. The Logos may have assumed the Man at the time of his beginning within the womb of the Virgin,[2] he may form the very own chosen temple of the Logos,[3] but after all we are left with an ordinary man (ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος),[4] who in virtue of the soul has gone into the highest heaven, whither no other man has ascended,[5] and who is there σύνθρονος with the divine spirit.[6] All thought of redemption vanishes.[7] The Man of Christ is but an example of godly life, who has prepared us for the way of heaven.[8]

[1] So Facundus is wrong when he says of Eustathius' teaching: *Arguitur unum Christum in duos dominos divisisse* (*Defence of the Three Chapters*, xi, 1).

[2] See above, p. 109, n. 1. [3] See above, p. 102 and notes.

[4] The comment of Eusebius of Caesarea on the teaching of Marcellus of Ancyra is very applicable here: εἰ δὲ τοῦτον (*i.e.* τὸν υἱόν) ἀρνοῖτο Μάρκελλος ὑφεστάναι, ὥρα ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον αὐτὸν ὑποτίθεσθαι ἐκ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς συνεστῶτα, ὡς μηδὲν τῆς κοινῆς ἀνθρώπων διαλλάττειν φύσεως (*de Eccles. Theol.* i, 20; Klostermann, *Eusebius Werke*, iv, p. 88).

[5] *De Eng.* 55, 24 ff. [6] *P.G.* xviii, 685 B.

[7] Like the rest of the Antiochenes, Eustathius is little occupied with the thought of redemption. The only reference I can find to the idea is in *P.G.* xviii, 680 C, where it is but a passing thought. From this point of view, of course, his Christology fails to answer the desires of the soul, and to express the central theme of the Christian gospel.

[8] See Cav. Frag. 33 (*Analecta Sacra*, ii, p. xxxix) and the first of the three Syriac fragments quoted above, p. 73, n. 8. Both are derived from his *Homily on Prov. viii*, 22. The former runs (Cavallera's text): ἀρχὴ γάρ τοι τῶν καλλίστων τῆς δικαιοσύνης ὁδῶν γεγένηται ἡμῖν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ χριστοῦ, τοῖς κρείττοσι τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων προσάγων ἡμᾶς, σεμνοπρεπῶς προσαρμόττει τῷ πνεύματι, ξενάγει εἰς τὸν παράδεισον, εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν ἀποκαθίστησι νομήν. διὸ καὶ ὁ χριστὸς ἔλεγεν· ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια

Before we turn to the place of Eustathius' Christological teaching in the Syrian tradition, we must note how he, like the rest of the Antiochenes, distinguishes the two natures in Christ. He was brought to do so largely through the doctrinal thought of his adversaries, who taught that the Logos took the place of the human soul in Christ. As we have seen already he holds that the soul is the seat of the sense-perceptions in the body. If then the divine takes its place, that divine must feel all the pangs as the body suffers. But this is to attribute passibility to an impassible God. So Eustathius rails against his foes. His own words will illustrate how he separated the natures, lest the divine should be said to have suffered.

But had it been fitting to ascribe to Him any kind of infirmity, anyone might have said that it was natural to attach these qualities to the Man, and not to the fulness of the Divinity, or to the dignity of the highest Wisdom, or to Him who is ascribed, according to Paul, as God over all.[1]

Again:

But if the sun, being a visible body, apprehended by the senses, endures everywhere such adverse influences without changing its order, or feeling any blow, be it small or great; can we suppose the incorporeal wisdom to be defiled, and to change its nature because its temple is nailed to the cross, or destroyed, or wounded or corrupted? The temple suffers, but the substance (*ἡ οὐσία*) abides without spot, and preserves its entire dignity without defilement.[2]

καὶ ἡ ζωή (St John xiv, 6). *τῷ μὲν οὖν ὀνόματι τῆς ὁδοῦ τὴν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον δηλοῖ περιβολήν, ὅπερ ἔστι τῶν σωματικῶν καὶ τῶν ὁρατῶν· γῆς γάρ τι μόριον ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ αἰσθητὸν ἔδαφος καθέστηκε· τὸ δὲ ὄνομα τῆς ἀληθείας* [*καὶ*] *τῆς ζωῆς τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς φύσιν· ἡ γὰρ ἀλήθεια πρᾶγμά τι νοητὸν οὔτε ὄμμασιν οὔτε ἁφῇ ὑποπίπτον.* Eustathius' interpretation of the "Truth" and the "Life" only serves to give further weight to our main contention that he does not posit the Son's personal existence. Contrast with this Athanasius' interpretation of the three titles. While he draws a somewhat similar distinction between the "Way" on the one hand, and the "Truth" and the "Life" on the other, pointing out that the "Way" refers to the Lord's humanity (*Expos. Fid.* 4), he uses the other titles to prove the fact of the Lord's true Sonship. For his interpretation of the "Truth" see *Orat.* i, 20, and for that of the "Life" see *de Synodis*, 41.

[1] *P.G.* xviii, 681 D.

[2] *P.G.* xviii, 684 C. Athanasius uses the same simile (of the sun) in his *de Incarn.* 17. But see above, p. 86, n. 1.

These quotations are taken from his *Homily on Proverbs viii*, 22. Similar thought is to be found in his other works. Thus in his *Interpretation of Psalm xcii* he says:

> Moreover, the prophet Isaiah following the tracks of His sufferings, among other utterances exclaims with a mighty voice, "And we saw Him, and He had no form nor beauty. His form was dishonoured and rejected among the sons of men" [Isaiah liii, 2, 3 (LXX)], thus distinctly showing that the marks of indignity and the sufferings must be applied to the Man, and not to the divine, adding immediately afterwards, "Being a man under stroke, and able to bear infirmity" [Isaiah liii, 3 (LXX)].[1]

Again, in a fragment from the same work we read:

> He it is who after the outrages was seen without form and comeliness, then again was changed and clothed with beauty, for the God dwelling in Him was not led like a lamb to death, and slaughtered like a sheep, being by nature invisible.[2]

Similarly in his *contra Arianos* he says that the two differ *naturaliter*; passion of death, taste of food, desire for drink, sleep, sadness, weariness, tears and any other change cannot co-exist with the fulness of the Divinity, since it is unchangeable by nature; these things should be applied properly to the Man.[3] Here we have only few of many examples, but they amply illustrate the point that Eustathius in separating the natures was a true Antiochene.

In his exegesis, so far as it can be gathered from the existing fragments, we must mark the same characteristic trait. We will take one or two examples. "Born of a woman, born under the Law" (Gal. iv, 4): the Logos was not born of a woman, but of the Virgin the Man was born; the Logos was not subject to the Law, being Law, but the human organ was under the Law.[4] "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father"

[1] *P.G.* xviii, 688 A. [2] *P.G.* xviii, 688 B.

[3] *P.G.* xviii, 693 (5th on page). Compare: *Quocirca aliud quidem erit mortale, aliud quidem praeter hoc immortale* (6th on page).

[4] *P.G.* xviii, 677 A, 680 B, C. The comment of Nestorius on the same passage is worth quoting: *τίς ἐγένετο ὑπὸ νόμον; ὁ θεὸς λόγος; nequaquam* (Loofs, *Nestoriana*, p. 297). Theodore of Mopsuestia has a kindred interpretation. See Swete, *Theodore of Mopsuestia on Minor Epistles of S. Paul*, vol. i, p. 63.

(St Jn. xx, 17): the Logos did not say this, who continues within the bosom of the Father, nor the Wisdom, but the Man who had not yet ascended.[1] "God hath made this man Lord and Christ" (Acts ii, 36): it was not the Wisdom nor the Logos which was made Lord and Christ, but the one who was lifted up on the cross.[2] These illustrations, and they could be multiplied,[3] only serve to assure us that the Christological thought of Eustathius is altogether in line with that of the later Antiochenes.

"Ideas which originated with Paul of Samosata were handed down in succession, and descended upon Diodore who became Theodore's guide along these evil ways." Such is the judgment of Leontius of Byzantium.[4] Though we would hardly call them "evil ways" we certainly agree with the main thought of the judgment, for it is quite evident that the principles of the Syrian tradition are to be found in the teaching of the three Bishops, and that Eustathius was one in the succession who handed down those ideas from Paul to Diodore.

First of all, let us mark the kinship between his Christology and that of Paul of Samosata. It has been pointed out many times already that for Paul the divine in Christ is not the personal Son of God. The Logos, he says, is ἐνεργός, and as such dwelt in the human Jesus.[5] It follows, then, that for him the indwelling is κατ' ἐνέργειαν, and thus, fundamentally, his Christology is like that of Eustathius. He, too, can say that Wisdom (σοφία) dwelt in Christ as in a temple,[6] and he, too, affirms its omnipresence at the same time, holding that it cannot be limited

[1] *P.G.* xviii, 680 D.

[2] *P.G.* xviii, 681 A.

[3] For instance, in *P.G.* xviii, 681 C, we have an interesting relic. Eustathius is condemning the Eusebian party (the fragment is from the *Homily on Proverbs viii*, 22) for falsely interpreting 1 Cor. ii, 8: "If Paul says that the Lord of Glory was crucified, clearly referring to the Man, we must not on this account refer suffering to the Divine. Why, then, do they put these two together, and say that Christ was crucified from infirmity?" Nestorius' comment on the same passage is interesting: εἰ ἐσταυρώθη ἐξ ἀσθενείας, τίς ἠσθένησεν, αἱρετικέ; ὁ θεὸς λόγος; (Loofs, *Nestoriana*, p. 357).

[4] Taken from Raven's *Apollinarianism*, p. 123.

[5] See above, p. 96, n. 2.

[6] See above, p. 8, n. 5.

within a man's form.[1] Moreover, he is akin to Eustathius in teaching a conjunction (*συνάφεια*) of the two natures in knowledge and communion (*μετουσία*).[2] Like Eustathius, he holds that the personality (of Christ) rests in the Man, and that this, together with the unipersonality of the Father and the Son, forms two personalities.[3] He, too, separates the natures in Christ. So he says that Mary did not bear the Logos, but she bore a man like us, though better in every respect; the Man Jesus is anointed, but the Logos is not anointed; one is Jesus Christ, but another is the Logos.[4] Again, if we accept the *Λόγοι πρὸς Σαβῖνον* as genuine, we find him teaching that the union of the two natures was brought about through "a concurrence of will, from which springs a oneness of activity". We have already seen that in all probability Eustathius thinks in the same way. It is noteworthy, too, that in the same work the exaltation of the Man is regarded as the reward of a holy life.[5] Thus it is clear that there is no uncertain kinship between the teaching of Eustathius and that of Paul, though the former is an advancement upon the latter. Both men seek to answer the question "What think ye of Christ?" from the Antiochene point of view, starting from the fundamental principles of the unity of God and the Lord's complete manhood. But Paul's is the cruder thought, approaching pure Adoptionism. Eustathius, while still maintaining the full human development of the Man assumed, gives the primary place to the Logos which bore the Man and dwelt in him as the very own temple of the Logos. In this way he prepared the ground for the later Antiochenes.

Only very few fragments from the works of Flavian and Diodore, despite the obvious importance of these men, have come down

[1] See above, p. 103, n. 2.

[2] *I.e. συνάφεια κατὰ μάθησιν καὶ μετουσίαν* (Loofs, *l.c.* p. 333). Compare the *μετουσία* of Paul with the *συνουσία* of Eustathius (above, p. 107).

[3] *ὁ πατὴρ γὰρ ἅμα τῷ υἱῷ εἷς θεός, ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος κάτωθεν τὸ ἴδιον πρόσωπον ὑποφαίνει, καὶ οὕτως τὰ δύο πρόσωπα πληροῦνται* (Loofs, *l.c.* p. 338; Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 37).

[4] Loofs, *l.c.* p. 331; Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 22.

[5] Loofs, *l.c.* p. 339; Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 40.

to us. But it is quite clear that they carried the tradition a stage further, and arrived at a position in advance of that of Eustathius. They were not members of the Eustathian party at Antioch, neither, so far as we can tell, did they borrow directly from the teaching of Eustathius. They accepted the principles of the tradition, and interpreted them in the light of their own day. With them, as we have seen already, the doctrine of the personal Sonship is fully established, and it is here that their teaching marks a development upon that of Eustathius. At the same time we find in their teaching much kindred thought. Both Flavian and Diodore distinguish the two natures in Christ. Flavian says: "What is akin to us, and not to the invisible nature is anointed with the Spirit";[1] Diodore holds that "the Man from Mary is Son by grace, but the God-Logos is Son by nature".[2] Flavian, like Eustathius, maintains most strongly that the divine does not suffer, writing: "When you hear of the Lord being betrayed, do not degrade the divine dignity (*ἀξίωμα*) to insignificance, nor attribute to the divine power the sufferings of the body. For the divine (*τὸ θεῖον*) is impassible and invariable".[3] Or again he says: "In nothing did the Godhead suffer, for the divine is impassible".[4] Moreover, like Eustathius, Flavian describes the manhood of Christ as the temple of the Logos,[5] and though we have no evidence to prove the point, there can be no reason

[1] Theodoret, *Dialogue* i; *P.G.* lxxxiii, 100 A.

[2] *P.G.* xxiii, 1560.

[3] Theodoret, *Dialogue* iii; *P.G.* lxxxiii, 304 D. Compare with this the saying of Paul of Samosata: *τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς σοφίας μὴ καθέλωμεν* (Loofs, *l.c.* p. 331; Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 22). Eustathius has a similar thought in *P.G.* xviii, 681 D, where he says that a "form of weakness" should not be ascribed *τῷ ἀξιώματι τῆς ἀνωτάτω σοφίας*.

[4] Theodoret, *Dialogue* iii; *P.G.* lxxxiii, 304 C.

[5] Theodoret, *Dialogue* i; *P.G.* lxxxiii, 77 B. Flavian thus interprets "The Word became flesh": "He is not turned into flesh, nor yet did He cease from being God, for this was He from eternity, but that did He become in the dispensation, having built His own temple (*τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ναόν*)". Compare with the last expression what is said above (p. 102, n. 4) concerning the similar teaching of Eustathius. It may be permissible to see beneath the statement that the Logos did not cease from being God grounds for the assumption that Flavian, like Eustathius, maintained the omnipresence of the Logos at the time of the Incarnation.

against the assumption that, like their predecessors and their successors, both he and Diodore taught the full physical and moral development of the human Jesus.

It is when we turn to the teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia, "the crown and climax of the school of Antioch", as Dorner calls him, that the position of Eustathius in the Antiochene tradition is revealed in its true light, for, as we shall see, the System of Theodore is but the acceptance of the principles of Eustathius, which are now set out in accordance with the doctrinal thought of the age. In particular, this can be seen from three points of view.

In the first place, Theodore takes the truth of the divine omnipresence and analyses it. Starting from the position that the presence of God in His saints cannot be the same as His presence in other men and in the irrational and inanimate creation, he draws a distinction between God's metaphysical and God's moral presence. God, he says, is present everywhere *κατ' οὐσίαν* ("according to His being") or *κατ' ἐνέργειαν* ("according to His activity"), but He is present in His saints *κατ' εὐδοκίαν* ("according to His good pleasure"). In such a manner (*i.e.* *κατ' εὐδοκίαν*) did He dwell in the human Jesus, though in this case He dwelt in him "as in a Son",[1] inasmuch as the Son by nature took to Himself the Man to dwell therein. Clearly, the distinction made by Theodore is an advancement upon the teaching of Eustathius, who seemingly treats the indwelling as *κατ' οὐσίαν* or *κατ' ἐνέργειαν*.[2] But at the same time it should be noted that the old ideas of divine omnipresence and divine indwelling, which we have seen in the teaching of Eustathius, form the basis of Theodore's system. The only difference is that he has carried them a stage further.

Secondly, we find that Theodore is but following in the steps of Eustathius when he insists on the truth of the Lord's complete manhood. He maintains that the God-Logos assumed a perfect Man, consisting of a rational soul and a human body,[3] and affirms

[1] Swete, *Theodore of Mopsuestia on Minor Epistles of S. Paul*, vol. ii, p. 296.

[2] See above, pp. 101, 104.

[3] Swete, *l.c.* p. 328.

his full physical and moral development. He says that he increased not only in age and physical strength, but also in wisdom and in every kind of knowledge.[1] He was tempted and endured the intense inward struggles which were his, seeing he possessed a rational soul.[2] In thus maintaining the place of the human soul in Christ, it is clear that Theodore was upholding one of the fundamental principles of the Syrian tradition against the prevailing Apollinarianism which was an outcome of Hellenic thought. We have seen already that with the same weapon Eustathius in his generation combated the somewhat similar teaching of the Lucianists.[3]

Thirdly, Theodore's age demanded that the problem of the Person of Christ should be solved. In the age of Eustathius the demand was not so pressing. But once again we find that Theodore's answer is not far removed from the doctrinal position of Eustathius. It is true that the former holds that the divine in Christ is the personal Son of God, but, although he firmly adheres to the Trinity, his system could have been established without it, for according to his teaching the Logos does not become man and share human experiences. While he maintains one Person (ἓν πρόσωπον) in Christ,[4] and affirms that the union of the two natures is indissoluble,[5] upon analysis it is evident that he only teaches a moral harmony between the two natures. He declares that a *hypostasis* cannot be impersonal, and so speaks of the person of the God-Logos and of the person of the Man.[6] The union, he says, is like that between man and wife, who are no more twain but one flesh.[7] There is the person of the God-Logos, and there is the person of the Man; yet, having regard to the conjunction (συνάφεια), there is one person.[8] Thus, although he may say that one is the person, one the will, and one

[1] Swete, *l.c.* pp. 297, 298, 335.

[2] Swete, *l.c.* pp. 311, 316, 317. See also Raven, *Apollinarianism*, pp. 289–291.

[3] See above, pp. 36, 52, and his teaching on the human soul of Christ pp. 105–108.

[4] Swete, *l.c.* p. 338. So also he denies that he speaks of two Sons or two Lords, *l.c.* p. 329.

[5] Swete, *l.c.* pp. 316, 329.

[6] Swete, *l.c.* pp. 299, 300.

[7] Swete, *l.c.* pp. 299, 324.

[8] Swete, *l.c.* p. 299.

the activity,[1] in reality he posits two persons, the one divine and the other human, who always will and act in the same way.[2] Such was Theodore's answer to the problem. Had Eustathius lived a century later we believe his answer would have been the same.[3]

Thus is the teaching of Theodore but the outcome of the teaching of Eustathius, whose doctrinal principles he interpreted in the light of his own age, and, as we have seen, the teaching of Eustathius himself goes back to that of Paul of Samosata, who should be regarded as one of the early pioneers of the Antiochene school of thought. Over against this Syrian tradition in the early history of Christian doctrine, we must set the other tradition, of Hellenic foundation, which differed widely from it, and through succeeding generations we must mark the conflict between them. The one, we may say, proceeded from Antioch, the other from Alexandria. Paul, in his generation, challenged the current Hellenic thought, with its inherent Subordinationism and its unsatisfactory Christology, only to meet with disaster. At the time of Eustathius it had developed, largely through the influence of the Lucianic school, towards the Arian position, and Arius himself in formulating his system had only brought that teaching to its logical conclusion. Once more did a faithful and determined upholder of the principles of the Syrian tradition rise to the attack. Such was Eustathius, and he, too, met his doom. Later, in the persons of Flavian and Diodore, and especially in the person of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Syrian tradition continued to maintain itself and the truth for which it stood against

[1] Swete, *l.c.* p. 339.

[2] Thus he speaks of the union as being brought about *ταυτότητι γνώμης* (Swete, *l.c.* p. 311), or *κατὰ τὴν σχέσιν τῆς γνώμης* (p. 310) or *τῇ σχέσει τῆς γνώμης* (p. 308).

[3] Tixeront's statement (*History of Dogmas*, Eng. tr. iii, p. 19) regarding the teaching of Theodore is equally applicable to that of Eustathius: "Like all the Antiochenes, the Bishop of Mopsuestia fails to see that the personality of Jesus Christ is in the Word, and that the mystery of the Incarnation consists merely in this, that the person of the Word, already possessing the divine nature, joined to itself a human nature, and that to this Incarnate Word can and must be ascribed all the actions and passions of the humanity".

the Apollinarianistic tendency of the day which found its basis in Hellenic thought. The bitter conflict between Nestorius and Cyril was the outcome. Once again the supporter of the Syrian tradition was doomed, and Nestorius was banished to his desert home. At the Council of Chalcedon in 451 the truth contained in each tradition was set side by side, but this was primarily due to western influence in the person of Pope Leo. A hundred years later, at the fifth Oecumenical Council, the Hellenic tradition was once more in the ascendant, and once more were the supporters of the opposing tradition condemned. It was the decision of the Eastern Church to side with Alexandria against Antioch. Nevertheless, the tradition we see in Paul of Samosata, Eustathius, Flavian and Diodore, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius, was more ancient. If in our reconstruction of doctrine we must return to this tradition,[1] the scribe, who has been made a disciple to the Kingdom of Heaven, will be able to bring forth out of his treasure things new and old, and one of the things old will be the teaching of Eustathius of Antioch.

[1] Bethune-Baker's verdict (quoted by Raven in his *Apollinarianism*, Pref.) is that "Paul of Samosata had behind him a genuine historical tradition to which in our reconstruction of doctrine we must return".

INDEX

Aetius of Lydda, 18, 39, 59 n.
Alexander of Alexandria, 10 n., 17, 19 f., 26, 29, 30 n., 49, 68
Alexandria, Synod of, 17, 18
Allatius, L., 61, 74, 75 n.
Anastasius Sinaita, 62 n., 83
Antioch, Council held at (324/325), 22 n.
Aristotelianism, of Eustathius, 81
Arius, 12, 15 f., 17, 19 n., 20
Asclepas of Gaza, 19, 44, 49 n., 57
Asterius the Sophist, 11 n., 12, 13 f., 18 n., 29 n.
Athanasius of Alexandria, 19 n., 26 n., 29 n., 40, 44, 57, 82, 87 n., 103, 112 n.
Athanasius of Anazarbus, 18

Bardenhewer, O., 25 n., 53, 61, 66 n., 70 n., 87
Basil, 17 n., 37 n.
Baur, C., 64 nn., 70 n.
Beryllus of Bostra, 9 n.
Bethune-Baker, J. F., 9 n., 120 n.
Bishops of the East (*temp. Eustathii*), 18, 31, 35, 46
Bithynia, Synod in, 18
Bolanus, 5 n.
Burkitt, F. C., 74 n.
Burn, A. E., 23 n., 88

Calandio, 50 n., 51
Cavallera, F., 44 n., 53, 64, 87
Chrysostom, 50, 55, 71 n., 82
Clementine Homilies, 7
Constans, 57
Constantia, 17 n.
Constantine, 18 n., 24 n., 25, 26, 31, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 53, 91 n.
Constantius, 56, 57
Cowper, B. H., 66
Cyrus of Beroea, 40, 48 n.

Diodore of Tarsus, 1, 97 f., 115 f., 119, 120
Dionysius of Alexandria, 4 n.
Dorner, 98 n., 104 n., 117
Duchesne, L., 49
Du Pin, L. E., 53

Ebionites, 7
Epiphanius, 8 n., 11 n., 19, 97 n.
Eudoxius, 12, 37 n., 38
Eulalius, 49
Euphration, 32 n., 49 n.
Euphronius, 43, 50
Eusebians, the, at Nicaea, 27 ff.; their conduct after Nicaea, 35 ff.; attitude of Eustathius towards them *c.* 328, 36 ff.; their intrigue, 39, 41, 45–48; attack supporters of Eustathius, 49 n.; attempt to elect Euseb. Caes. as Bp. of Antioch, 49 f.; their conduct at Sardica, 56 ff. (*see also* "Lucianists")
Eusebius of Caesarea, 14, 14 n., 111 n.; his sympathy with Arius and Eusebians, 17, 18, 34 n.; (?) excommunicated by Council of Antioch (324/325), 23 n.; his account of opening of Nicene Council, 24 f.; presents his Creed, 30; his quarrel with Eustathius, 31–34, 40; his teaching, 33 f.; his account of Antiochene affairs *c.* 330, 42 f.; member of cabal against Eustathius, 39; prob. President of Council which deposed him, 44, 46; refuses see of Antioch, 44, 49 f.; accuses Eustathius of "Sabellianism", 34, 82, 83, 86, 88, 98
Eusebius of Dorylaeum, 70, 82, 95 n.
Eusebius of Nicomedia, pupil of Lucian, 12; teaching of, 12 f., 52 n.; character of, 17 f.; leader of Eusebians, 18; at Nicaea, 28, 30, 35 n.; restored to imperial favour, 39, 45, 46

Eustathian Schism, 43, 50 n., 54, 56
Eustathius of Antioch:
Life: Bp. of Beroea, 19, 24, 72; translated to Antioch, 23 n., 24; a Confessor, 24; at Nicaea, 24–30; his quarrel with Euseb. Caes., 31–34; his attitude to the would-be presbyters, 37 f.; his tyrannous rule, the uproar, and the summoning of the Council which deposed him, 41–46; the three charges against him, 39–41, 46–48; banished, 48; place of banishment, 50 f.; date of his death, 53–56
Works: Spurious works, 60–70; doubtful fragments, 70 f.; his *de Eng.*, 32 n., 74, 75–80, 83 n., 89, 90; his *Interpret. of Ps. xv*, 71, 72; his *Interpret. of Ps. xcii*, 71, 72, 113; his *Titles of the Pss.*, 72; his *Hom. on Prov. viii. 22*, 27, 35, 36, 73, 73 n., 89, 103, 111 n., 112, 114 n.; his *de Anima*, 51 f., 55, 72, 73, 74; his *contra Arianos*, 52 f., 74 f., 104, 113
Teaching: Church's tradition concerning, 82; on unity of Godhead, 83, 86, 89; on Son's generation, 83, 90–92; on duality between Father and Son, 83, 92; on divine omnipresence, 83, 85, 86, 89 f.; opinions of scholars on his orthodoxy, 86 ff.; its inherent "Sabellianism", 47, 88 f., 95 f., 99; his teaching in relation to that of Marcellus, 93–96; to that of Paul of Samosata and later Antiochenes, 96 ff.; to that of Theophilus (*see* "Theophilus"); terms he uses in his Christology, 100 f.; divine omnipresence in relation to Incarnation, 103 f.; "the Man of Christ", 36 n., 73 n., 104–109; his insistence upon complete manhood of Christ, 105–109; his use of *prosopon*, 109 f.; distinguishes natures, 112–114; place of his Christology in Syrian tradition, 114–119
Character: 27, 28 n., 30, 32 n., 36, 45, 47, 48 n., 51, 52, 82 f., 99
Eustathius of Sebaste, 37 n., 38
Eustolium, 37 n.
Eustratius the presbyter, 24 n., 74
Eutropius, 54, 75
Evagrius, 54
Evangelus, 68

Facundus, 26, 75, 82 f., 109 n., 111 n.
Firmilian, 4 n.
Flacillus, 49 n., 50
Flavian of Antioch, 1, 97, 115 f., 119, 120
Fulgentius, 82

Gelasius, 75, 100 n.
George of Laodicea, 37 n., 38, 40, 59
Gregory of Berytus, 18
Gregory of Nyssa, 73, 80 n., 87 n., 103
Gregory, presbyter of Caesarea, 25 n., 60 f.
Gregory Thaumaturgus, 4 n.
Gwatkin, H. M., 10 n., 53 f.

Harnack, 8 n., 9 nn., 11 n., 23 n.
Helena, 40, 48
Hellanicus, 20 f., 49 n.
Hieracas, 68 n.
Hilary, 8 n., 21 n., 37 n., 44 n.
Hippolytus, 95
Hosius of Cordova, 14 n., 21 nn., 24 n., 26, 29, 49 n., 57
Hymenaeus, 4 n., 5 n.

Jahn, A., 75 n.
Jerome, 2 n., 21, 24, 34 n., 47, 49 n., 50 n., 68 f., 81 n., 82
John of Antioch, 26
John of Damascus, 74
Julian, 17 n., 54
Julius, 57
Justin Martyr, 80 n.

Klostermann, E., 14 nn., *et passim*
Kymatius of Paltus, 24 n., 47 n., 48 n.

Lawlor, H. J., 7 n., *et passim*
Leo, 120
Leontius of Antioch, 12, 37, 50 n.

Leontius of Byzantium, 70, 97 n., 114
Licinius, 18 n., 24 n.
Loofs, F., 5 nn., 10 n., 22 n., 23 n., 53, 66 n., 88, 93–95
Lucian of Antioch, 9 ff., 12
Lucianic Creed, 11 n., 14 n., 29 n.
Lucianists, character of, 12; teaching of, 12–15, 16, 58 n.; not thoroughgoing Arians, 16 f., 28; their teaching opposed by Eustathius, 20, 21 f. (*see also* "Eusebians")

Macarius, 19, 20 f., 26, 29, 30 n., 49 n.
Macedonius of Mopsuestia, 21 n., 22
Macrostich, 9 n.
Mai, A., 73
Malchion the Sophist, 5 f., 9, 11 n.
Marcellus, 14, 30 n., 49 n., 57, 93 ff., 111 n.
Maris, 12, 18
Marius Mercator, 97 n.
Maximus of Bostra, 4 n., 5 n., 9 n.
Maximus Confessor, 106 n.
Meletius, 54, 55, 97
Menophantus, 28 n.
Methodius, 75 n., 80 n.
Musonianus, 45, 46, 47, 48, 57

Narcissus, 14, 18, 23 n., 25 n., 59
Nestorius, 1, 82, 113 n., 114 n., 119, 120
Nicaea, Council of, 24–31; Canons of, 32, 44, 49; Creed of Eusebians presented at, 27 ff.; Second Council of, 2 n., 83

Origen, 2 ff., 9 n., 23 n., 32 n., 72 n., 73, 75 n., 76 n., 91, 93

Patrophilus, 18, 28 n., 35, 39, 40, 59
Paul of Samosata, his teaching, 8, 96 f., 103 n., 114 f., 116 n.
Paulianists, 10 n.
Paulinus of Antioch, 21 f.
Paulinus (Bp. of Eustathians), 50 n., 54, 56
Paulinus of Tyre, 14, 17, 18, 35, 40, 49
Philippopolis, Synodical Letter of Council of, 21 n., 24 n., 47, 47 n., 57
Philogonius of Antioch, 19 ff.
Philostorgius, 11 n., 12, *et passim*
Photinus, 54, 56, 66 f., 97 n.
Plato, 80
Platonism, 2, 73

Raven, C. E., 6 n., 53, 114
Robertson, A., 18 n.

Sabellianism, 3 n., 4, 18, 31, 86, 98; Eustathius accused of, 34, 35, 38, 40 f., 46 f., 86, 88, 95, 98
Saltet, L., 64 n.
Sardica, Council of, 54, 56–59; Statement read at, 58 nn.
Schwartz, E., 23 n.
Secundus, 28 n.
Seeburg, E., 23 n.
Severus of Antioch, 72, 83 n.
Socrates, account of quarrel between Eustathius and Euseb. Caes., 34 n.; account of downfall of Eustathius, 40 f.; *et passim*
Sozomen, account of downfall of Eustathius, 40 f., 43; on his literary worth, 80; *et passim*
Srawley, J. H., 64 n.
Stephanus, 37 n., 38, 50 n., 59
Subordinationism, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 33, 98, 119
Syrian tradition, 1, 119 f.; beginnings of, 7; in Theophilus (*see* "Theophilus"); perhaps in Beryllus, 9 n.; in Paul of Samosata, 8 f., 96 f., 114 f.; perhaps in Philogonius and Paulinus, 20 ff.; in Eustathius, 95, 96 f., 98, 114 ff.; in Flavian and Diodore, 97, 115 f.; in Theodore Mops., 98, 117 ff.; in conflict with Hellenic tradition, 9, 21, 34 (and in history of Eustathius generally), 119

Tertullian, 80 n.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 1, 98, 101 n., 117 ff., 119 f.
Theodoret, account of downfall of Eustathius, 39, 41, 44, 46 f.; *et passim*

Theodorus of Heraclea, 59 n.
Theodorus Lector, 51 n.
Theodotus of Laodicea, 17, 18, 23 n., 35, 39, 59 n.
Theognius, 12, 28 n., 35 n., 39
Theonas, 28 n.
Theophanes, 51 n.
Theophilus of Antioch, 91 n., 93, 95 n.
Tillemont, 51, 53
Tixeront, J., 119 n.

Valesius, 21 n.
Venables (art. on "Eustathius" in *D. C. B.*), 32 n., 48 n.
Victor of Tunnuna, 51 n.

Zenobia, 7

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY W. LEWIS, M.A., AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 643-2500
All books are subject to recall

GTU Library
3 2400 00300 3138

DATE DUE

JUL 15 1994
JUL 14
MAR 21 1995
JUN 27 1995
JUN 16 1995
FEB 27 2006
FEB 14 2008

GAYLORD
PRINTED IN U.S.A.

C0-CZY-679